

A
COLLECTION
OF
QUERIES.

Wherein the
Most material OBJECTIONS
from *Scripture*, *Reason*, and *Antiquity*, which have as yet been
alledged against Dr CLARKE's
Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity,
and the *Defenses of it*, are Pro-
posed and Answered.

With an APPENDIX:

In which are offered to the Consideration of
the Learned, some QUERIES from *Scripture*,
Reason, and *Antiquity*, concerning
the *vulgar scholastick* Explication of the
Doctrine of the *Trinity* and *Incarnation*.

By a Clergyman in the Country.

LONDON. Printed for James Knapton, at
the Crown in St Paul's Church-Yard. 1716.

The Epistle Dedicatory.



To the Reverend

D^r. C L A R K E,

Rector of St James's Westminster.

Reverend Sir,



Cannot but observe, that though the *Reformed Religion* is built on this single Foundation, that the *Scriptures only* are the Word of God, and the Rule of Christian Faith; and that all *humane* Determination of Doctrines, are fallible and uncertain: And tho' the *Church of England* expressly declares in her 6th, 20th, and 21st *Articles*, that the *Scriptures contain all Things necessary to Salvation*; and that therefore the Church ought, not only not to decree any Thing Against Them, but not to enforce any Thing to be belie-

A *

ved

The Epistle Dedicatory.

ved for Necessity of Salvation, *BESIDES* what is clearly reveal'd in Them, or indisputably prov'd by Them; and that all humane Decisions, even those of General Councils, *because they may err and have erred, have neither Strength nor Authority in Things ordain'd by Them as necessary to Salvation, unless it may be declar'd [or prov'd] that they are taken out of Holy Scripture*: Yet nevertheless, there have been, and are now many amongst us, and some of these even *wise and learned and vertuous Men*, who ascribe a Sort of *Infallibility* to our Reformers, and think that *Christianity* was by them brought to that full and beauteous *Proportion*, that either to add to or diminish any Thing from *That Stature*, is to render it monstrous and deform'd. To call in Question the *Sense or Explication* of any *receiv'd Doctrine*, or to vary one *Dot or Tittle* from what is *vulgarly* call'd *Orthodoxy*, is in Their Esteem *Presumption*, and *Heretical Pravity*; And tho' the most clear and convincing Arguments are offer'd both from *Scripture* and *Reason* against any *prevailing Notion*, they must not be heard or regarded, because This they think has a Tendency to disturb the *Peace of the Church*, and is an endeavouring to remove the *ancient Landmarks*. But our honest *Forefathers* (whom they seem desirous so implicitly to adhere to.) well understood

The Epistle Dedicatory.

derstood that the *True Peace of the Church*, was founded only in the *Honour* and in the *Truth of Christ*; And in Vindication of these, they scrupled not to do what accidentally and in Event *disturbed* That *Peace* which the *Church in Their Time* was indeed possess'd of, but which was highly dishonourable to God, and destructive of the Common Good of Christianity; and such as was then, and always will be, not *True Peace*, but a dangerous *Supineness*, and fatal *Negligence of the Things of God*. They plainly saw that the Claim which *one Sett* of Men made, both to read and interpret the *Scriptures* as their sole Right; was nothing but false Pretence and Usurpation: and that they had so clog'd and fetter'd them by groundless *Traditions*, which they impos'd as *infallible Interpretations* and necessary Supplements to the Word of God, that in the End they came to be made use of by Them *only as Steps* whereon to raise their own temporal *Interest* and *Greatness*, and to gall the Consciences of their *bigotted* and *superstitious Votaries* with a *Toke of Ecclesiastical Tyranny*. From this Slavery of those *Pharisaical Usurpers*, our *Reformers* with great Courage redeem'd us, by asserting and maintaining that the *Scriptures only were the Word of God*, and the Rule of all reveal'd Truth; and that they were the common

The Epistle Dedicatory.

Birthright and Inheritance of all Christians. To the *Gospel*, (the *Gospel* as Christ's *only Vicar* upon Earth,) they made their Appeal from the *See of Rome*; To this only sure and *infallible Guide* and *Rule* whereby to judge of all Controversy, they went, to know the Will and Mind of God; *This Spirit* they knew belong'd to *Christ*, but that all *others* were the Spirits of Delusion and Superstition: Upon *This Holy Ground*, they settled the Ark of God; upon *This Rock*, they built the *Protestant Church*; and from *This Divine Armoury* alone, they drew their Spiritual Weapons to encounter all the *Powers of Darkness, Heresy, Schism, and Idolatrous Superstition*. This Heavenly *Treasure* of all Christian Truth, they transmitted down to us as pure and *unadulterate* as their humane Weakness would permit, to be the just and only Standard of our *Faith*: And whatever Doctrines they receiv'd and taught, not deliver'd in the Words of God Himself, these they knew and profess'd to be of no Authority more than as they agreed with the Word of God; and therefore they could be necessary for no Man to receive any further, than He believ'd them to be so. Therefore to argue and insist, that *Their Decisions*, in any Point not certainly or clearly reveal'd or deliver'd in the Words of *Scripture*, are final, peremptory

The Epistle Dedicatory.

ry and never to be any more examined ; is to raise again That *Spirit*, which *They* laid with so much Christian Zeal and Sincerity, and at the Expence of so much Christian Blood. This is That very *implicit Faith*, which *They* saw had fatally blinded the Understanding of the *Church* ; and it is the very Cement which holds the great *Machine* of *Popery* from falling in Pieces. Nothing can be more contrary to and destructive of the *Reformation*, or more absurd in itself, than to own that the Separation from the Church of *Rome* is built and maintain'd on this, that *She* is *fallible* and imposeth Errors as necessary Terms of Communion and Articles of Christian Belief ; and yet to plead for and exact such an *implicit* Submission to *our own* Doctrines, as if *We* were *infallible*. If we are fallible in *one* Point, are we not so in *another*, and consequently in *all* Points ? And since we own'd ourselves to be fallible, by leaving *some* of the Errors of the Church of *Rome* ; are we *infallibly* sure that we left them *all*, or that we are not in the *Protestant Church* liable to Error, as well as when we were in the *Romish Church* ? The Scriptures, were *Then* *misunderstood* ; and may they not possibly in some Things be so *now* ? And tho' we have cleared the Floor from a great Deal of the Rubbish, yet are we sure that there is *no Chaff* left amongst the

The Epistle Dedicatory.

Wheat ? While there is Prejudice and Corruption and Ignorance in our Natures, there always will be Room for *Reformation* : And tho' *the chaste Virgin of Christ* whose Presence we enjoy, be fair and lovely ; yet can we absolutely say that she is cleans'd from *every Spot or Wrinkle ?* Are all the great Truths of the Gospel understood or explain'd by us with *infallible* Certainty ? If they are ; why do we not say so, and *prove* that God hath given us an *unerring Spirit ?* If they are not ; why do we not disclaim such *Presumption in Fact and Reality*, as well as in *Words ?* Why do we not allow That Christian Liberty, with which God hath made us free, and upon which our *Reformation* stands ; to *search the Scriptures, that in them we may* of our own selves, and with actual Knowledge and Understanding, find *the Words of eternal Life ?* Why do we put the *Bible* into our People's Hands, and not persuade them to read it in an unprejudiced Manner with their *own* Eyes, and understand it impartially with their *own* Reason ? Why do we *discourage*, nay why do we not *encourage* learned and pious Men in their free and unbiassed Enquiry after Divine Truth ; that by their studious and honest Labours we may be the better instructed to confute and convince Gainsayers, and be able to give a good Account of the Faith and Hope that
is

The Epistle Dedicatory.

is in us? But this is our Misfortune: We praise and admire the Courage and Resolution of our *Forefathers*, in vindicating the Word of God from Popish Error and Superstition; but yet are not easy to let *others* go on even in the same Steps towards Perfection. Many Good and learned Men have seen, and do see, that we are reformed indeed, but possibly not yet wholly free from Error. Those who are Zealous for the Truth of Christ, cannot but in his Name call for some farther Degree of Reformation. But what's the Consequence? Is the Information which they bring, tho' with the greatest *Meekness and Humility*, generally heard or considered? Nay, are not their Persons, tho' eminent for all Christian Vertues, often reproached; and their Words, without hearing, condemned by *Many*? Whoever goes about to detect an Error, or explain a Doctrine otherwise than exactly according to the prevailing Form of *humane* Words at that particular Time and Place; is in danger to purchase the Truth which He gains thereby, and the Good which he would do to the Church, at the Loss of his own good Name and Reputation: And 'tis well if *That* will satisfy the Clamours of unreasonable Men. There was a Time when Loss of all Preferment, Liberty, and even Life itself, were the unhappy Attendants of promoting

The Epistle Dedicatory.

ing the Honour and the Truth of Christ. In our own Memory, their Faggots were prepar'd, and ready to be set on Fire. But, praised be God! *Liberty of Conscience*, and true *English Natural Liberty*, returned together at the Happy *Revolution*. Those great Dangers (I hope) are now blown over, and will never be able to raise any more Fears against the *True and Only Friends* of both *Church and State*; whilst the Royal and Christian Vertues of *KING GEORGE*, shining in Him and his Illustrious Protestant Heirs, continue [God grant for ever!] to adorn and to defend *Both*. But yet the great Discouragements and Reproach which Learned and Vertuous Men have met with from *too Many*, for asserting and endeavouring to restore and advance Christian Truth, (and we have not yet wholly recovered our Charity and Countenance for such *Worthies*,) hath been, and is, to the Grief of all true Protestants, the evident *Cause* of *neglecting in good Part the Study of the Scriptures*. Men are not willing to walk in that Light, by which they be in Danger of beholding nothing but Injury and Disgrace; and had rather wink, or turn their Eyes another Way, than see That, which tho' infinitely lovely in itself, yet (they know) may possibly procure them Hatred and Contempt. Therefore *every Art and Science* flourisheth,

The Epistle Dedicatory.

eth, and is rewarded; only the most valuable, the saving and Divine Knowledge of the Scriptures, is with too Many neglected or affraid to appear openly abroad. This, the *Deists* and the *Socinians* are well aware of; and need not be told what Advantage to make of it. They smile within themselves to think, that they can charge the usual Explications of some Articles of our Faith with Absurdity and Contradiction, and yet not be oppos'd with that Armour most formidable to all Error, *the Word of God*. If we pretend *Scripture-Revelation* in Defence of our selves against the *Deists*, this confirms them in their Confidence of denying all reveal'd Religion; assuring themselves that God can never be the Author of what appears to them, according to the Explication perhaps most earnestly pressed upon them, to be necessarily false: And the *Socinians*, who acknowledge the Authority of the Revelation, support themselves even from some of *our own* Reasonings with unanswerable Arguments *ad Hominem* against the Divinity and even the very *Being* of the Son of God. The *Papists* also, are not wanting to make good their Ground against us: They can and do perpetually tell us, and tell us with Reproach, that (according to some of our Explications) we maintain as great Absurdities and Contradictions in our Faith, as any which we
left

The Epistle Dedicatory.

left in their Communion: They argue, [and we are *abash'd* to hear it,] that some of our scholastick Explications of the Doctrine of the *Trinity* are as contradictory to Reason, and to Scripture too, as *Their* Explication of the Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Holy Sacrament is to Sense: And therefore (say they) if notwithstanding the seeming Conflict betwixt Faith and Reason in the *one* Case, Custom and Human Authority is thought sufficient to determine and satisfy the Consciences of Men; what Reason can we give why the same Authority should not be able to decide the no greater Conflict betwixt Faith and Sense in the other Case? For this Cause, *Reverend Sir*, I cannot sufficiently admire and commend your *Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity*; the Design of which Book, is (I think) as noble and truly Christian, as ever enter'd into the Heart of Man; to deliver so important a Point of the Christian Faith, from that Contradiction and Confusion, which the metaphysical Sophistry and unintelligible Jargon of the *Schools* hath long ago introduc'd, and which hath ever since prevailed with too Many, in the Explication of it, to the great Dishonour of *Christ*, and the Reproach of the *Protestant Church*, and the Hindrance of Christian Knowledge; and to reconcile it clearly to the unquestionable Rule of
Scrip

The Epistle Dedicatory.

Scripture and Reason. This Design, when *encouraged* and made effectual, must soon confound and stop the Mouth of the *Deist*, and abate the Triumph of the *Socinian*: And the bigotted *Papist* must let go his strongest Hold against us, and cease any Longer with Pretence of Reason and Argument to justify *Himself*, and reproach *Us*. Never was the Cause of God and Truth put upon a fairer Trial and Issue, than you have put This; and (pardon Me, Sir,) never I think manag'd with greater Strength and Clearness of Reason, and with more awful Regard to *Peace* and *Charity*. To the *Word* and to the *Testimony* the Appeal is made by you; and *There only* it ought to be determin'd: Not by one or two single Texts, which cannot be denied to be spurious or misinterpreted; or by a *Tradition* of Faith, which appears to the most learned and Inquisitive to be no better than Fiction and Imposition: But, as you have propos'd, by the whole Tenour of the Scriptures collected and compar'd and explain'd by clear and indisputable Reason. It was reasonable to expect, that such a fair and important Proposal might demand an unprejudiced and *impartial Hearing*; at least could give *no Offence* to learned and pious Men. And indeed, of those who are sincere Lovers of God and of Truth, few (I hope and am willing to believe) are or can be offended

The Epistle Dedicatory.

fended at so useful a Design. And O! that the precious and healing Balm of *Moderation* and *Charity*, which God hath so largely pour'd on the *Head* of his Church, ran down also on All the inferior *Garments*! that the *Christian* and *Protestant Spirit* which rules the Hearts of our excellent *Prelates*, diffus'd it self through the Minds of All the Sons of *Levi*! that we were *All* disposed to lay aside our Prejudices, at least all Heat and Passion; and strove to Unite in Love and Affection, tho' we differ'd in Judgment and Opinion! and spar'd, with Christian Meekness and Forbearance, the Persons and Characters of our Brethren; and spent all our Zeal and Indignation, against the Malicious and common Enemy! The *Light* in which you have with great Pains and Judgment plac'd the *Scriptures*, hath already shined forth in several Parts of the Church; and your Eyes have the Happiness and Pleasure to behold an impartial Enquiry after Truth, gain Ground every Day, to the Honour of Christ, and the Joy of unprejudiced and good Men. But there is a *Spirit* gone out amongst Some, against you; a clamorous and uncharitable *Spirit*, which (instead of Studying and examining into the Truth,) calls for Censure and Condemnation not on *you* only, but also on All those who have the Courage and Sincerity to appear in the same Design. This (I confess) at present

The Epistle Dedicatory.

present hath cast a Cloud over impartial Inquiries ; and deters many honest Men, (who have not those great Advantages and excellent Talents with which God hath endow'd *you*,) from declaring That Truth of which they are heartily convinced. But in *This* also you have Reason to rejoyce ; that this unreasonable and unpeaceable Spirit, which clamours against *You*, is the same which now rages (in Some even to Madness and Distracti- on,) against one of the best of *Kings* that ever sat on the *British Throne*. A Prince, who was sent by God in a Time of Need and great Distress, when our Enemies were many and Powerfull, and had projected our Captivity and Ruine ; to be a Blessing and Deliverance to this Church and Nation. None but a Prince of his consummate Wisdom, joyned to a Courage and Resolution worthy of a *Protestant*, and worthy of a *King*, could have snatch- ed *this Church* (which is the Glory of the *Reformation*,) and this *Kingdom* (whose Liberty, Wealth, and Courage is not only the Envy and Admiration, but the Terror of *Europe*,) from the Hands of those who were ready to have given up *Both* to Popish Superstition and arbitrary Power. But He came to save us, not so much from the Invasion of a bi- gotted *Popish Pretender*, (weak and im- potent in Himself, and unable to hurt us ;)

The Epistle Dedicatory.

us;) as from our *greatest* Enemies, and those who only are able to ruin us, *viz. Ourselves*. And as God, in his great Mercy to this unworthy Nation, reserved and sent him to support the sinking Protestant Cause; so He hath given him a wise and understanding Heart to choose such a *Council*, whose Hearty Love and most vigilant and active Zeal for the Preservation of the Protestant Faith and the true Protestant English Liberty, render them not only the most necessary, but the alone fit and powerful Instruments of making both *Church* and *State* secure and Happy. God therefore sent Him to restore and perpetuate the *Protestant British Line*, upon the most illustrious and fruitful stock of *Brunswick Lunenburg*; and, with it, to revive and cause to flourish all the *Protestant British Greatness* and *Vertues*; to regain and advance the *English Name* and *Credit*; to secure and settle for us, on a lasting and immovable *Basis*, the *Liberties* of free-born Subjects. And, to complete and crown at once all the Blessings of both *Church* and *State*, God sent him to quench and utterly destroy the *Spirit of Papery*, which hath so long been animated and fomented, but is now making its last Effort, and struggling in the Pangs of Death. When This pestilent Spirit, which hath ever since the *Reformation* disturb'd the Quiet
of

The Dedication.

of this Isle, is entirely banish'd; and
Great and Good KING GEORGE,
the Desire and Delight of Nations, the
Guardian of Protestants, and the Support
of the Liberties of Europe, is seated se-
cure and easy in the peaceable Possession
of his Legal and unquestionable Right
to the Crown of these Realms; then we
may expect to see Peace and Truth meet
and kiss each other, and Righteousness to
look down from Heaven upon us: Then
shall all Party and Faction cease, and
there shall be no hurting nor destroying
nor persecuting in all Gods holy Mountain:
Then shall our Good and Gracious KING
behold the Delight of his Eyes, and the
Joy of his Heart, and the successful End
of all his Labours and Endeavours after
our Happiness; a Nation flourishing in
Peace, and Wealth, and Liberty; in
Unity, Love, and Loyal Obedience; and
a Protestant Church advancing the Ho-
nour and Kingdom of Christ, and esta-
blish'd on the only sure Foundation of
Truth and Charity, under his wise Ad-
ministration. These Blessings (I hope)
are reserv'd for This Age, and for these
our Days; nor has there ever been a
brighter or a nearer Prospect, of seeing
this Church and Nation, Secure, Great,
and Happy. These Thoughts, Sir, are (I
am sure) the Subject of your Prayers and
a Study

The Dedication.

Study to promote : And as I am perswaded that they come from the God of Peace and Truth, so they will not (I trust) fail of his Blessing. Natural and reveal'd Religion, have been eminently supported by your learned and immortal Labours against their two grand Enemies, the *Atheists*, and *Deists* : And the two great *Corrupters* of the Christian Faith, the *Papists* and *Sabellians*, will (I doubt not) receive a deadly Wound from your late most judicious and elaborate Writings, which it is the Design of the following Papers to vindicate ; Not, Sir, to add any Strength or Force to the Truth and Reason that is in them, but only to pay a small Acknowledgement and Return for the Benefit which I have received from them. What I have done, is with a sincere and honest Design to convince Others of what I my self am verily convinc'd, that your Explication of the Doctrine of the *Trinity* is most agreeable to Scripture and Reason : and that the greatest and most plausible Arguments, which have been offer'd, and which I have faithfully proposed in their full Strength, *against* it, and *for* a different Explication ; are weak and unconvincing, and not at all consistent either with Scripture or Reason. And because the Testimony and *Authority* of the Primitive *Antenicean Church*, is pretended

The Dedication.

pretended to, and urged by the Maintainers of the *scholastick Notion* in their own Defence; I have moreover indeavoured to show, [tho' it is indeed of no very great Moment in a Case so clearly determined in Scripture,] by a brief Collection of Notes, that *This* likewise is very far from doing them any Service. And your Adversaries have Reason to thank you; that you do not insist on the Writings of the most ancient Fathers and Synods, (tho' clearly and *almost* unanimously on your Side,) as being of any *Authority* or *decisive Evidence*, [tho' *They* are glad to do so, whenever they think it for their Turn;] but only use them as *Illustrations* to your Cause. This is your great Advantage and your Glory, and which must recommend your Books to the serious Perusal and Consideration of all learned and unprejudiced Persons; that you insist on *no* other Proofs, but That Doctrine which Christ and his Apostles taught, and delivered to the Church as the only Rule of our Faith. Whatever is the *Nature*, or shall be the *Success* of my Performance, I doubt not but you will approve the *Design* of it; which is to promote the Honour and the Truth of Christ, by the same

a 2

Means

The Dedication.

Means as you have done; and thereby also to declare, that with the greatest Love and Respect I am (tho' *Personally Unknown* to you) your Affectionate and Sincere Friend, and an hearty Welwisher both to your Cause and Person.

December 21st, 1715.



TO THE
READER

HAVING already set forth the Design of the ensuing Papers; I think it fit to advertise the Reader of the Reason of making them publick, and of doing it in the Manner I have done. Receiving some Time ago a Collection of Queries, drawn from Scripture, Reason, and Antiquity, and offered against Dr Clarke's Scripture-Doctrine and Replys, by a learned Anonymous Author; which were thought very material Objections, and propos'd to Me to be considered; I drew up the following Answer to them. Which being perused by some learned Friends, they

TO the READER.

they judged it would be of Service to the Christian Church to make it publick. And this Judgment of theirs, I could not resist; knowing that the Design of doing a Service to the Church of Christ, was a sufficient Apology for the meanest Performance. But because there were some other Objections, (supposed to be very important, and not particularly or fully replied to,) in Other Authors which have opposed Dr Clarke's Explication of the Doctrine of the Trinity, and not contained in the forementioned Queries; in order to make my Design the more complete and of a Piece, I drew up what appear'd to me to be the chief and most considerable of them, into the Form of Queries, and (as much as I could) in the respective Authors own Words; that the Arguments might not be thought to want any of the Force, with which the Authors themselves had propos'd them. In Conclusion; I have offer'd from the same Heads, (viz. from Scripture, Reason, and Antiquity,)

TO the READER.

Antiquity,) to the Consideration of the Defenders of the scholastick Notion, some Queries which I think contain Arguments direct and conclusive against Their Explication of the Doctrine of the Trinity and Incarnation. If those learned Authors, whose Arguments I have considered, think that I am mistaken, or have not fully answered their Objections, and that they are able to answer mine; I should be glad if they wou'd candidly and ingenuously defend Themselves, and convince Me of my Error. But if it doth appear that there is Force and Truth in what I have offered against Them, I hope no Pretence of any modern Authority will be given as a Reason why it should not prevail.

THE

To the READER.

Antiquity, to the Consideration of the
 Defenders of the Scholastic Notion,
 some Quæries which I think contain
 Arguments direct and conclusive against
 Their Explication of the Doctrine of
 the Trinity and Incarnation. If those
 learned Authors, whose Arguments I
 have considered, think that I am mis-
 taken, or have not fully answered their
 Objections, and that they are able
 to answer mine: I should be glad if
 they would candidly and ingeniously
 descend themselves, and convince me
 of my Error. But if it both ap-
 pears that there is Force and Truth
 in what I have offered against Them,
 I hope no Pretence of any modern
 Authority will be given as a Reason
 why it should not prevail.

THE

Mat
 Chur
 Q
 Do
 ly Sp
 T
 pulat
 who
 that
 in th
 quiri
 who
 dance
 Chur



THE INTRODUCTION.



Y Way of Introduction to the following Papers, it is necessary to take Notice of two material Queries offered by way of Objection against the Whole; viz.

Qu. 1st. *Do not Dispute in Matters of Religion disturb the Peace of the Church?*

Qu. 2d. *Is not the present Controversy of the Doctrine of the Trinity, concerning Opinions merely Speculative?*

These Objections, I find, are wonderfully popular; and seem to satisfy even some of those who have the best Character in the Church; that Truth, particularly the Truth concern'd in the present Controversy, is not worth inquiring after; and that *They* deserve Censure, who do what may accidentally give Disturbance to the present Quiet and Repose of the Church.

B

The

The Introduction.

The *Former* of these Objections, whatever Force there may be in it, lies not against Me, but against *all Controversies* in General, which have been or may be in the Church; so that I have no particular Reason to be afraid of it, or Obligation to consider it. The *Latter* indeed seems to carry somewhat of Weight in it, and in an especial Manner to affect me. But because *Both* are plausible and much insisted on, I will return a particular Answer to them.

To the *First*. That Disputes in Matters of Religion do indeed sometimes disturb the *Peace* of the Church, is too apparent from our uncharitable Censures on each other in every Difference of Opinion. But may it not be justly said, that this is our *own Fault*; and that our *Peace*, if it be so easily molested, is not settled on a true and firm Foundation? Were We *Christians* indeed; did the Love of Truth, and of one another, rule in our Hearts; did Unity of Affection and mutual Forbearance, the true Signs of the Peace of Christ, prevail amongst us; Disputes cou'd not disturb or weaken this *Peace* of the Church. All Controversies concerning *fundamental* or necessary Truths, wou'd receive a speedy Decision from the *Word* of God; and Those concerning Points *speculative* or unnecessary for Christians to be resolv'd in, wou'd be either laid aside, or continued without Breach of Love or Charity; and so cou'd have no ill Influence on the Church. Therefore that Disputes do any Harm, is not owing to a free and impartial Inquiry after Truth, (which in Matters of Religion is the common Right of all Christians, and cannot justly be restrain'd;) but to the *Way* of managing Disputes to unreasonable Prejudice, and Want of Charity

The Introduction.

3

city in the contending Parties, and, above all, to the Desire of *imposing* Things unnecessary. Take away *these*, and Disputes will never forebode any Ill to the Church; but may be, and oftentimes are, a Means of *discovering* many great and valuable Truths, which without Them would have been lost among a Multitude of Errours; and also of settling and *confirming* in the Minds of Men, those Truths which are already receiv'd by them. But since it is impossible Wholly to remove *These* Causes of Breach of Peace out of the Way, and bring Mankind to a right Christian and peaceable Temper; since Superstition, Ignorance or Prejudice in some, Uncharitableness and self-Love in others, will raise and heat their Passions, when any *popular* or vulgarly received Notions are call'd in Question; Disputes are therefore to be cautiously begun, and manag'd with Discretion; and Opinions *merely speculative*, such as do not immediately concern the Honour or Worship of God, or the Practice of any Christian Duty, are not to be too warmly insisted on, against the common Bent and Inclination; The *external* or *visible* Peace of the Church being always preferable to *These*. But if the Dispute has any Relation to Points Fundamental or Practical, such in which the *Honour of God* or a *Religious Life* is concern'd; it is not to be laid aside for Fear of raising accidentally any Disquiet in the Church. These are *superiour* in their Natures, and of greater Consequence than mere *external* Peace or Quiet; and are design'd to procure the true *internal* and most valuable Peace of the Church, founded in the Knowledge and Love of Jesus Christ; and in order to settle also the *external* Peace of it for the future, on a more sure and lasting Foundation. Taking therefore

therefore the Church, as it is in this corrupt and imperfect State; where Prejudice, Superstition, and the Love of Power and Greatness bear always too high a Sway, (and have almost banish'd That *Christian Peace*, which begins in mutual Affection and Forbearance, and ends in Charity; and so much discouraged *Truth*, that free and impartial Inquiries after it, do very frequently produce great Heats and Animosities;) I shall consider how far the *Peace* of the Church is to be regarded in our Disputes about Matters of Religion. Controversies in Matters of Religion, are (as I observ'd) of two Sorts: Either concerning Opinions *merely speculative*, such as tend indeed to the Improvement of the Mind in divine Knowledge, but have no direct Influence upon Practice, nor promote any moral Duties; Or else concerning *Fundamental and Practical* ones, such as have immediate Respect to the Honour and Worship of God, and a religious Conversation. The *Peace* of the Church also is two-fold; *external* or visible, *internal* or invisible. Christian Societies enjoy the *first*, when they go on in a seeming Uniformity. They enjoy the *Second*, when they serve God [as our Lord Himself saith, *Joh. 4. 23.*] *in Spirit and in Truth*. The *former* or *external* Peace, being a State of outward Calmness is indeed of no small Value and Regard, and ought not to be compos'd on every trifling Pretence of Reformation. Whatever can be innocently comply'd with, ought not easily to be disturb'd or made a Matter of Contention. And the Truth of Opinions *merely speculative* if not impos'd as *necessary* Parts of Christianity, (as the Jewish Converts in the Apostolic Times would have impos'd on the Gentiles the Necessity of Circumcision;) may, I think

The Introduction.

5

be resigned to the Considerations of Peace and Quietness. But then, as the *Latter* or *internal Peace*, founded on an Agreement in the *fundamental* and *practical* Truths of Christianity, and in the *not imposing* as necessary, what is not such; is the only *True and Christian Peace*, without which the *external appearing Quietness* is but a *false and delusive Peace*: 'Tis certain the Regards for the *external and appearing Peace*, (though they ought to be very great, yet) ought never to prevail to the Prejudice of the *inward and truer Peace of Christianity*. The Practice of Our *Saviour* and his *Apostles*, shows that they did not think themselves guilty of disturbing the *Peace of the Jewish Church* by their preaching of *Christianity*: And we think our *Reformers* not justly charged with disturbing the *Peace of the Christian Church*, by their preaching up the Necessity of adhering to *Scripture only* as the Rule of Truth, and against the *imposing* (as necessary) any *Humane Doctrines* or *Explications of Doctrines*. So long as men continue *fallible* and imperfect, *Hay and Stubble* may be built upon the *Foundation of Christ*, 1 Cor. 3, 12; and *Chaff* may be thrown in among the *Wheat*. It is therefore Always necessary for men to study and search the *Scriptures*: From whence it cannot be, but *Disputes* and *Controversies* in Matters of Religion will arise, which (when managed with Freedom, Meekness and Charity,) can never prejudice the *Faith*, or really hurt the *Peace of the Church*; but may be and are the chief Means of preventing *Blindness and Ignorance*, and of preserving the *Faith* pure and uncorrupt among *Christians with Understanding and Knowledge*.

That we enjoy Christianity in its present Purity, is it not wholly owing to the free Debates

and impartial Enquiries which were made by our Reformers into the State of Religion? And have not Christians *now* the same Right of examining and debating the Sense of Scripture, which they had then? unless we will say that an extraordinary Power then appeared, which immediately vanish'd, never to be recall'd or exercis'd again; or that we have a Right to debate the Sense of the Scriptures in our Reasonings with *Papists*, but not with *Protestants*; as if the Reformation had set up in the *Protestant Church* *That Infallibility*, which it cast out of the *Popish Church*. Or was the *Peace of the Church* less valuable Then, and less to be regarded, than it is Now? If Prescription can give an indisputable Right, to maintain the seeming Peace of the Church, against all Inquiries after Truth; it is plainly on the Side of *Popery*, and will support its most absurd Tenents. Why then should not That Principle of *searching the Scriptures*, and of drawing our Faith from the Word of God, which, notwithstanding the Pretence of the Peace of the Church, we plead so strongly and unanswerably against the *Papists*; be allow'd to take Place in our own Cause? Are we who have seen and forsaken many Errours, affraid of seeing or discovering others; and unwilling to forsake them, if at any Time they shall appear to us? *Errour* only, hath Reason to be affraid of Disputes; and therefore *Popery* and *Mahometanism* plead most against them, and object most strongly the Peace of the Church. But Truth, or a Religion founded on the Word of God, hath no Reason to fear or hinder Disputes; for they tend only to reform the Church, if in any degree defective; or the more to settle it, if already sufficiently re-form'd.

The Introduction.

7

form'd. And indeed free Inquiries and Disputes, are the greatest Advantage to, and Friends of Truth. Their exact and impartial Scrutiny, like the Art and Skill of the nicest Jeweller, gives this precious Gem its true Value and Lustre. And let Fashood appear in all the Craft and Subtilty, with which the *Father* of it can invest it; yet 'tis impossible that it shou'd ever be able, in the way of fair and impartial Inquiries, to dispute one Truth out of the World. Truth is Then in the greatest Danger, when all *Disputes* are restrain'd; and when *Power* and *Interest* are the only *Oracles*, where we are allow'd to inquire after it. For tho' worldly *Interest* and *humane Power* can never suppress Truth, and establish Error, by *convincing the Understanding*; yet (as is evident in *Popish Countries*) it may do the Work as effectually, and make Error appear as Truth, by keeping it *blind and ignorant*, and discouraging all Debates and Inquiries into whatsoever shall be imposed. By these Means alone it is, that *Mahometanism* and *Popery* not only keep their Ground, but spread in the World. Allow but free Inquiry and Examination; hold the Balance Even, betwixt Truth and Error; and let not Interest or Power, be cast into either Scale; and the blessed Work of true Christianity will go on apace, and *Popery* and *Infidelity* soon disappear in the World.

The only Thing which can with any Appearance of Reason be objected against what has been said, is; that Disputes concerning any Doctrines already determin'd by the Church, tend to unsettle the present Establishment, and to raise Doubts and Scruples and Fears in the Minds of Men; that if they once find themselves mistaken in one Point, they may

think they may be mistaken in another, and so in all Points; and that therefore Disputes do not only disturb the Peace of the Church, but weaken, and indanger the Overthrow of, the whole Christian Faith. But this Objection, however plausible and popular, is both very weak, and of pernicious Consequence.

The *Weakness* of it appears; because the Doctrines disputed, being either *true* or *false*; if they be *true*, they can be in no Danger by Disputes concerning them; because Truth is not only always in itself more plain and convincing than Error, but is made still more so, by being supported and cleared against all the Opposition and Delusion of Gainsayers: And therefore This will always be a Means of settling Truth already receiv'd, more firmly in the Minds of Men; who will hereby gain great Opportunities of understanding the Scriptures more perfectly, (which are the only Rule of Protestants whereby to judge of, and determine all Controversies,) and so be able to give a good Account of the Faith that is in them: I am sure the *Church of England* hath lost no Ground, by all the Contentions which it hath had ever since the Reformation with all its Enemies. On the other hand, if any Doctrines be *erroneous*, they are destructive of the Churches true Peace, and ought not any longer to be retain'd; and the amending them, can never shake the whole Establishment, but is a carrying on the very *Design* of the Reformation, which was to *purge the Floor* of Christ, and dress the *Wheat* from the *Tares*; and to receive and hold those Truths only, which God's Word has declar'd, and *That Faith which was once delivered to the Saints*. So that this is so far from endangering the Settlement of the Protestant Religion,

The Introduction.

9

gion, that it is fixing it on its *only right Foundation*. And if the Detection perhaps of some Mistakes, gives Men Occasion of examining the Grounds of their whole Faith, [a Thing possibly not thoroughly done even by our *Reformers* themselves, with Regard to the present Controversy,] what Danger can there be in That? Are we affraid that our People shou'd thoroughly understand what we teach them; or that our Faith shou'd be brought to the Test of God's Word, on which only we declare it to be built? I heartily wish to God, that All Men wou'd do this for themselves seriously and impartially; It wou'd (I doubt not) give the true Protestant Church of England the greatest Advantage it ever yet had over all its Enemies.

If it be alledged further, that in Questions wherein there are considerable *Difficulties* on Both Sides, it is best always to *acquiesce* in what has happened to be *already* determined; I answer; Just the Contrary is True. Where it is acknowledged there are considerable *Difficulties* on Both Sides, There all possible Encouragement ought for that Reason to be given to Learned Men to *examine* Things thoroughly, in order to clear those *Difficulties*; And in the meantime, above all Things, men should not venture to build any religious *Practice*, upon the *supposed* Truth of One Side of a Question, which is acknowledged to have very great *Difficulties* on Both Sides. And in All Questions which in their Nature may be thought necessary to be decided; the greater *Necessity* and *Importance* men think there is of making a Decision, the greater Care ought they always to take, that the Decision be indisputably *right*, and that it extend

no farther than *Necessity* requires; least possibly *Error* be promoted instead of Truth.

If, lastly, it be ask'd, how the weak and unlearned, which are always the greatest Part of Professors, shall be able to resolve themselves, and settle their Minds in the midst of Controversies depending, and perhaps never entirely ended? The Answer is; If the Controversy be concerning Points very material or necessary for a Christian to be resolv'd in, a sincere and honest Mind cannot be long in Doubt which Side to take; the Scriptures being very full and clear in all such Points, to even a vulgar Capacity: But any one, after his best and most diligent Enquiry into the Sense of the Scriptures, cannot satisfy himself, each contending Party seeming equally to be favour'd by them; he may be sure that it is not necessary (if for the Controversy to be at all decided) at least for himself to be at all resolv'd, or to believe one Side rather than the other: He may suspend his Belief, or joyn with either Part without any Hazard to his Salvation.

But, under such Pretences as these, to suppress all Debates in Matters of Religion, is (which is the next Thing I observed concerning this Argument) very pernicious to true Religion itself: Because This Argument serves *All Professions of Religion* alike; and, since there are more false than true, is consequently a great Hindrance to the promoting of the true Faith. This is as good a Plea for *Jews, Turks, Pagans, and Papists*, as for *our Selves*: These have all settled Notions of Religion as well as we; and, since *we* are not infallible any more than *They*, 'tis evident that the Objection is as good on *their* Side as on *ours*, and may be and is made by *them* against *us*, as well as by *us* against *them*. So that

Judaism

The Introduction.

II

Judaism, Mahometanism, Paganism and Popery must, by this Argument, remain undisturb'd and uninquired into, as well as Protestantism. The Papists have a peculiar Advantage over us in this Point: They pretend, and perhaps think, themselves to be infallible; And cou'd they prove it, they wou'd undoubtedly be as much in the right to prohibit any Doctrine of *Theirs* from being disputed or call'd in Question, as we have to forbid the Truth of any Part of Scripture, which we acknowledge to be God's Word, to be made the Subject of Debate or Controversy. But since we know and own our selves to be fallible in all Points, in all our Interpretations and Decisions of the Sense of Scripture, which is the only Rule of our Faith; we cannot be excusable, if we restrain or condemn free and impartial Debates and Inquiries in Matters of Religion. In a Word: To deny any Christian Doctrine to be tried at any time by That Rule, is to deny the Rule itself, and to set up humane Authority instead of that of the Word of God.

As to the *Second* Query, viz. Is not the present Controversy of the Doctrine of the Trinity, concerning Opinions *merely speculative*? answer: If the Opinions are on each Side *merely speculative*, why then should they not (so much the rather,) like all other indifferent Questions, be proposed with all Freedom and without Offence? But whether they be indeed *merely speculative*, (and if they are *not*, then they are of so much the greater Importance;) deserves to be considered by every sincere Christian, *very seriously*.

The Dispute is not, (as some imagine,) concerning the absolute *Metaphysical Substance*, Nature, or *Essence* of the divine Persons, (for the Scriptures

Scriptures meddle not at all with that;) but concerning their *relative Powers, Characters and Offices* with Regard to *Us*; concerning the *Methods* us'd by *God* in the *Creation and Government* of the *World*, and in the *Redemption and Sanctification* of *Mankind*, by *his Son our Lord Jesus Christ*, and by *his Holy Spirit*; and concerning the *Manner* how we should worship *God* (*ἡμεῖς δὲ, πατέρα πάντων ἐχόντες*, as 'tis expressed in the *Creed*;) the *One Supreme God* even the *Father*; [how we should, according to our *Lord's Direction*, *Job. 4, 23*, *worship the Father in Spirit and in Truth*]; by and through the *Intercession* of the *One true Mediator* his only *Son Jesus Christ our Lord*, and under the *Guidance and Influence* of his *Holy Spirit*, (*praying in the Holy Ghost*, *Jude 20.*)

Not only in *Matters of Speculative Opinion*, (which are always of less importance;) but with regard to *Practice* also, very great *Alterations and Innovations* in the solemn *Worship of God*, were introduced into the *Church* in the *Fourth Century*; founded purely upon the supposed certain *Truth* of their then *Philosophy and Metaphysics*. Whether this was a *Foundation* of sufficient *Certainty*, upon which to build a *Superstructure* of That Kind; can never be too carefully considered.

The *True Difference* between the *Heathen Philosophy* and the *Christian Theology*, seems to be This. The best and wisest *Pagans* worshipped one *God*, by the *Mediation* of many false fictitious *Deities*; to whom also they paid a *Subordinate divine Honour*, but such as no way belonged to them; and therefore they became guilty of *Idolatry*, *worshipping they knew not what*, as our *Lord* saith, *Job. 4, 22.* or as *St Paul* expresses it, that which was *nothing in the World*

1 Cor. 8, 4; their subordinate Deities and Heroes either having no Existence at all, or none of that real Power and Dominion, on Account of which they paid a religious Honour to them. On the contrary, we Christians are taught to worship the *one true God and Father of All*, by *One only true Mediator* who is his *Son* our *Lord and Saviour*, and one *Holy Spirit* who is (in Subordination to Both) our *Sanctifier*. Therefore it is every Christian's Duty to endeavour (according to the Creed taught at his Baptism,) distinctly to understand *the Supremacy of the One God the Father*, to whom (as being Alone *ὁ πᾶντες ἑξ' ὧν*) Supreme Honour is peculiarly due; and the *Redemption* purchas'd by the Son, and the *Sanctification* wrought in us by the *Holy Ghost*, according to the *Will* of the *Father*. At least, *whatever Opinions* prevailed at any time in Matters purely *metaphysical and speculative*, (which ought never to cause any Breach of Charity;) yet if, in *Practice*, the *Object of publick Worship* was always preserved *uniform, clear and distinct*; (which was constantly done by the whole Christian Church, till about the Times of the Council of *Constantinople* in the *Fourth Century*; and the doing of which, could no way afford Matter of Offence or Doubt to any Christian, of any *speculative Opinion whatsoever*;) must not every reasonable Person necessarily agree, that This would evidently tend to promote the *Glorry of God*, and the universal *Peace and Unity* of the *Church of Christ*?

Do not *All Christians* necessarily agree, in *worshipping God through Jesus Christ*? according to That Excellent Exhortation in our Office for Ordaining of Priests; "that you will continually pray to God the Father, by the Mediation of our only Saviour Jesus Christ, for the Heavenly Assistance

The Introduction.

"Assistance of the Holy Ghost." Do not *All Christians* likewise necessarily agree in That *Worship*, which the *Scripture* gives to *Christ* as our *Redeemer* and our *Advocate* with the *Father*, when it says; *Worthy is the Lamb that was slain, And, Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our Sins in his own Blood, and has made us Kings and Priests unto God and his Father, to him be Glory and Dominion for ever and ever?* But when he is lookt upon, not as a real distinct Person, condescending to be made *Man* for us; but only as a *Name*, *Mode*, *Attribute* or *Manifestation* of the *One God the Father Almighty*, having no *true and proper Existence*, but showing forth itself as a *Divine Power* in the mere *Man Jesus Christ*; and his *Worship* is thereupon confounded with that due to the *Father* only; Have we, in *This* case, any certain *Object*? and are we not in danger of That *Reproof* our *Lord* gives the *Samaritans*, *ye worship you know not What?*

Further: Would it not much tend towards perswading the *Jews* to receive the *Gospel*, the *Turks* to quit the *Alcoran* for the *Scriptures*, and the *Infidels* to believe *reveal'd Religion*; if we propos'd to them our *Faith* according to the *pure Simplicity* wherein our *Lord Himself* taught it, every Part of which is reasonable and intelligible. But can there be Any *Hopes* of ever convincing the *Reason* even of the most *fair and unprejudiced Jew or Pagan*, that *The most High God, the Infinite Supreme Being* himself, whom not only the *Law* and the *Prophets* but the very *Light of Nature* also, declare to be a *Pure, Simple, Uncompounded Spirit*, incapable of *Change* or *Motion* or any proper *Affection* whatsoever, came down from *Heaven*, and was really united to a *Humane Body* in the *Womb* of a *Woman*, was
made

The Introduction.

15

made *Flesh*, was born, and dwelt amongst Men, in the *Fashion of Man*; nay, that even the very Person of [*ὁ πατριγενής*] the *Almighty and Impassible God*, became subject to Sufferings, Pain, and Death itself in our Nature? These are the undeniable Doctrines of Scripture concerning the *One Supreme God*, if our Lord Jesus Christ be individually *He*. And I wish All the Defenders of the scholastick Notions would *seriously* consider, whether they *must* not, and *do* not, in Defence of their Doctrine, affirm all This; and whether Any, who have been stiled *Patricians*, ever affirmed more; and whether the Thing be either *reasonable* or *possible* in itself, or any where *taught in Scripture*, or likely to be a Means of propagating *Christian Religion* in the World. We most justly argue against the *Papists*, that the Absurdities and Contradictions which they have introduc'd into the true Faith and Worship of God, are an irrefragable Bar against the reasonable Conviction of all who are ignorant of, or Enemies to *Christianity*; and these must necessarily be taken out of the Way, before we can expect *true Religion* to prevail over *Infidelity*. As therefore 'tis with the greatest Reason and Justice that we condemn *Them*, for laying *Offences* before the Church of Christ, which He hath denounc'd a particular Wo against, Mat. 18, 7; and which not only hinder those who are *without* from entering in, but make many even of those who are *within* to be worse *Infidels* than the very *Heathens*; so *We ourselves* ought greatly to take care, least by needlessly imposing any Humane Explications of Doctrines as necessary Parts of Christianity, we become in any degree guilty of the like Offence. The *Immorality*, *Profaneness* and *Uncha-*

Uncharitableness, which so much prevail amongst Christians, have given *Infidels* great Occasion of Triumph; but, Blessed be God! Our Religion gives no Countenance to these Vices, but denounceth the severest Punishment against them: But can we as easily stop the Boasting which they make from the *needless Difficulties* in some of our Explications of Faith? Blessed again be God! His *Word*, which is the Foundation and Rule of our Faith, is clear from This Charge also. All the Advantage which they take or can take, is not from our Religion, (that's the *Bible* only,) but from our *Selves*; not from the *Scriptures*, but from Things built upon them by *humane* Authority from our *Explications* of some Doctrines in a Manner which seems to them unreasonable and therefore they conclude not reveal'd; and from our rigorously insisting on some Things and imposing them as necessary, which were not so esteemed from the Beginning of Christianity. From this Cause it is, that *Infidelity* spreads wonderfully among Christians. It being therefore the Design of the present Controversy, to contribute towards removing these Offences, and thereby to promote the Kingdom and Glory of Christ; it cannot but deserve the *serious* and *impartial* Consideration of All, who are sincere Lovers of God and his Truth.

S E C T

Nu
pake
We ha
Baih
Pf.
hova,
Parts
Founda

S E C T. I.

As to SCRIPTURE:

Texts propos'd to prove that God the Father, and the Son of God, or our Lord Jesus Christ, are [individually] one and the same *Jehova*.

DEUT. 6. 4. *The Lord [Jehova] our God, is One Lord [Jehova.]*

Exod. 3. 15. *The Lord [Jehova] God of your Fathers — hath sent me unto you; This is my Name for ever, and this is my Memorial to all Generations.*

Psal. 135. 13. *Thy Name O Lord [Jehova] endureth for ever, and thy Memorial O Lord [Jehova] throughout all Generations.*

Hos. 12. 5. *Even the Lord God of Hosts, the Lord [Jehova] his Memorial.*

Gen. 19. 24. *The Lord [Jehova] rain'd upon Sodom and Gomorrah, Fire and Brimstone from the Lord [Jehova] out of Heaven.*

Numb. 21. 5, 7. *The People spake against God [Belohim.] We have spoken against the Lord [Baihovah.]*

Ps. 102. 25. *Of old hast Thou [Jehova, spoken of in the foregoing Parts of the Psalm,] laid the Foundation of the Earth.*

Apply'd to Christ.

1 Cor. 10. 9. *Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted, and were destroy'd of Serpents.*

Heb. 1. 10. *Thou, Lord, in the Beginning hast laid the Foundation of the Earth.*

C

II. 6.

Is. 6. 1, 2, 3. I saw the Lord [Jehova] sitting upon a Throne; above it stood the Seraphims, — and one cry'd to another, Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord [Jehova] of Hosts.

Is. 40. 3. The Voice of him that cryeth in the Wilderness, prepare ye the Way of the Lord [Jehova.]

Hof. 1. 7. The Lord said, I will have mercy on the House of Judah, and will save them by the Lord [Jehova] their God.

Zec. 2. 10. And I will dwell in the midst of Thee, saith the Lord [Jehova.]

Zec. 3. 2. And the Lord [Jehova] said unto Satan, the Lord [Jehova] rebuke Thee.

Zec. 10. 12. I will strengthen Them in the Lord [Jehova,] saith the Lord [Jehova.]

Zec. 12. 10. They shall look on Me, [Jehova, speaking by the Prophet,] whom they have pierc'd.

Joh. 12. 41. These Things said Isaias, when He saw his [Christ's, spoken of v. 37,] Glory, and spake of him.

Mar. 1. 3. The Voice of one crying in the Wilderness, prepare ye the Way of the Lord.

Luk. 2. 11. — Is born in the City of David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord.

Joh. 1. 14. The Word was made Flesh, and dwelt among us.

Joh. 19. 37. Another Scripture saith, they shall look on Him [Jesus Christ, v. 34.] whom they pierc'd.

CONSIDERATIONS

on the foregoing Texts.

GOD tells Moses, *Exod. 6. 2, 3*, saying, *I am the Lord [Jehova;] and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by the Name of God Almighty, [that is, by the Vertue of my Name El Shaddai expressing Power;] but by my Name Jehova, [by the Vertue of my Name expressing Being, and also giving Being to, (i. e. performing) my Word and Promises, as the learned Mr Ainsworth observes,] was I not known (manifested) unto them. So that the distinguishing Characteristick Name, by which God manifested himself to Abraham &c. was God Almighty [El-Shaddai, ׀ שֵׁדַּי, LXX.] Gen. 17, 1. — The Lord appeared to Abraham, and said unto him, I am the Almighty God (El Shaddai, ׀ שֵׁדַּי, lxx..) But when God came to fulfill the Promise which He made unto Abraham; and to give unto him, that is, unto his Seed, (*Gen. 13, 15*, compar'd with *12, 7*.) the Inheritance of the Land of Canaan; then He reveal'd himself to the Jews, the Posterity of Abraham, by his Name Jehova, [by the Vertue of his Name as importing his Mercy in the Performance of the Covenant made with their Fathers Abraham, &c.] and declar'd that That shou'd be his Name for ever, and his Memorial to all Generations. *Exod. 3. 15*. This Import of the Name Jehova, and the Reason why God particularly reveal'd Him-*

C 2

self

self by it to the Jews, is gather'd from *Exod.* 6. 6, 7, 8. 34, 6. Therefore say unto the Children of Israel, I am the Lord [*Jehova*,] and I will bring you out from under the Burdens of the Egyptians, and I will rid you out of their Bondage, and I will redeem you with a stretched out Arm, and with great Judgments,—and I will take you to Me for a People, and I will be to you a God: and ye shall (thereby) know that I am the Lord [*Jehova*] your God.—And I will bring you unto the Land concerning which I did swear to give it to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob, and I will give it you for an Heritage, I am the Lord [*Jehova*.]—And the Lord [*Jehova*] pass'd by before Him, and proclaim'd (the Name of the Lord, or *Jehova*, v. 5,) the Lord, the Lord [*Jehova*, *Jehova*,] God merciful and gracious, long-suffering and abundant in Goodness and Truth. The Reason of God's revealing Himself to Moses and the Jews, particularly by the Name *Jehova*, and declaring it to be the distinguishing Character by which He would be known unto them, being thus briefly open'd: We must enquire to what Person this Name *Jehova* belongs; and we shall find that it is the Name of the one Supreme God, reveal'd in the New Testament by the Title of God, the Father. I have observ'd that *Jehova* is the Name of the same Person who reveal'd Himself to Abraham to be his God under the Title *El Shaddai*, or the Almighty God, *ὁ θεός*; and accordingly to the Name *Jehova*, [*Ehjah*, v. 14,] is added the God of your Fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, *Exod.* 3; 15, 16. But this *El Shaddai* or *ὁ θεός*, the God of Abraham and of our Fathers, St Peter expressly tells us, *Acts* 3, 13,

Unity of God.

21

is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; saying, the God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob, the God of our Fathers, hath glorify'd His Son Jesus &c. And 'tis plain He must mean God the Father alone, exclusively of all other Persons; otherwise He might as well have said, that Jesus the Son of God, the God of Abraham, &c, hath glorify'd his Son Jesus; which any one will perceive to be unintelligible. Therefore it is evidently prov'd, that the one Supreme God, revealing Himself, *Exod. 3. 14, 15, 16*, by the Name *Jehova*, is the Person of the Father only.

But, Secondly; Because St *John* hath told us, that No Man hath seen God [the Father, *Joh. 6. 46.*] at any Time, *Joh. 1, 18.* and that none have heard his Voice or seen his Shape, *Joh. 5. 37*; and yet the one Supreme *Jehova*; (God, the Father of Christ,) is said to appear and talk to *Moses*; Christians both ancient and modern have always concluded, that this one Supreme God *Jehova*, did not manifest Himself or speak in Person, but by another Person his visible Representative, who is call'd his Angel, *Exod. 3, 2*. What this Angel said to *Hagar*, *Gen. 16; 7, 8, 9, 10, 11*; is said to be spoken by the Lord [*Jehova*, represented and speaking by the Angel,] *v. 13*. This Angel also said, *Gen. 31, 13*, I am, [that is, *Jehova*, or *El Sbaddai*, whom I represent, and in whose Name I speak, is] the God of *Bethel*. And this Angel, stil'd the Angel of the Covenant, *Mal. 3, 1*; the Angel of God's Presence, *Isai. 63, 9*; and in whom the Name of God was, *Exod. 23, 21*; is our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, appearing and speaking in the Person of God the Father; according to the

C 3

unanimous

unanimous Opinion of all * Antiquity, and
as is well concluded from the Analogy and
Comparison of the New Testament with the
Old,

* Ἐν ἰδέᾳ πυρός ἐκ βάτε προσωμάνησεν αὐτῷ ὁ ἡμέτερος
Χριστός, "Our Christ (saith Justin Martyr) convers'd with Moses
out of the Bush, in the Appearance of Fire," *Just. Apol. 1.* A-
gain, Ἰεδαῖοι ἐν ἡγνπάμενοι αἰεὶ τὸν πατέρα καὶ ὅλων λελαληκέναι
τῷ Μωσεί, καὶ λαλήσαντες αὐτῷ ὅτι υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, ὃς καὶ ἀγγε-
λὸς καὶ ἀπόστολος κέκληται, δικαίως ἐλέγχονται, "The Jews
[saith He] "are justly reprov'd for imagining that the Father of
all Things spake to Moses, when indeed it was the Son of God, who
is call'd the Angel and Messenger of the Father," *Apol. 2.* Again:
εἰ καὶ τὸ το γέγονε τότε, ὡς καὶ ἀγγελὸν καὶ θεὸν ἐμὲ ἐν τῇ ὁπλισίᾳ τῇ
τῷ Μωσεί γενομένην ὑπάρχει, — ἔχ' ὁ ποιητὴς καὶ ὅλων εἶναι θεὸς
τῷ Μωσεί εἰπὼν αὐτὸν εἶναι θεὸν Ἀβραάμ *εἰς. ἀλλ' ὁ ἀποδείχθει*
ἡμῖν ὡφθαί τῷ Ἀβραάμ εἰς. τῇ τῷ ποιητῇ καὶ ὅλων δελεῶσαι
ὑπερῆς, "It so be [saith He] that the Appearance which Moses
saw, was both an Angel and God; — it was not God the Crea-
tor of the Universe, which then said to Moses that He was
the God of Abraham &c; but it was That Person who (as I
have before shew'd you) appear'd to Abraham, ministring to the
Will of the Maker of all Things." *Dial. cum Tryph.* And The-
ophilus Antiochenus, Ἀναλαμβάνων τὸ πρῶτον τὸν πατέρα καὶ κυρίως
τῶν ὅλων, ἔπος παρεχέτο εἰς τὸν ὡφθαίσειν ἐν πρῶτῳ τῷ θεῷ
καὶ ὡμίλει τῷ Ἀδὰμ, "This Word of God (saith he) taking upon him-
self the Person of the Father and Lord of all Things, came in
to Paradise, and talk'd with Adam in the Person of God;" *Apol. Lib. 2.* And Irenaeus, Καὶ αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, τοῖς
πρὸ Μωυσέως πατριαρχαῖς, κατὰ τὸ θεῖκόν καὶ ἐνδοξόν, ὡμίλει τῷ
θεῷ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ &c. "The Word of God (saith he) did himself
in a divine and glorious Manner, converse with the Patriarchs before
Moses; and with those under the Law, *εἰς.*" *Lib. 3. Cap. 11.*
And Tertullian: Nam & profitemur Christum semper egisse in Dei Pa-
tris Nomine; ipsum ab initio conversatum; ipsum congressum cum
Patriarchis & Prophetis; ceterum Patrem nemini visum; —cujus Au-
thoritatem & Nomen ipse erat Deus, qui videbatur Dei filius. "We
profess [saith he] that Christ always acted in the Name of God
his Father; that it was He, who convers'd upon Earth from the
Beginning; that it was He, who appear'd to the Patriarchs and
Prophets; —that the Father Himself was never seen by any
—but that in His Name and by His Authority, the Son of God
which appear'd, was God;" *Adv. Marc. Lib. 2. Cap. 27.* And the
Synod of Antioch, Ποτὶ μὲν ὡς ἀγγελὸς, ποτὶ δὲ ὡς κύριος, ποτὶ
θεὸς μαρτυρούμεθα. Τὸν μὲν γὰρ θεὸν τῶν ὅλων ἀσεβὲς ἀγγελοῦ καὶ

Old, whereby it appears that all the great Things spoken of the one God *Jehova* in the Old Testament, are reveal'd in the *New* to be the Acts of God the Father by his Son our Lord *Jesus Christ*. Therefore *Jesus Christ* the Son of God, being the *Angel* or Messenger and the visible Representative of the invisible Father; acting in his Name, and by his Authority; and appearing and speaking in his Person, in the Revelation of his Will to mankind; might well be stild by the Name of the One Supreme Being, *Jehova*. And the One Supreme *Jehova*, viz. God the Father, being the *Fountain* and Original Cause of the Creation and Government of the World, and the Redemption of Mankind; but, in all these, acting not immediately by Himself, but by his Angel the *λόγος* or *ἄγγελος* who is his Son *Jesus Christ*; is said to do all those Things, which in the Event are reveal'd to be done by his Son *Jesus Christ*.

C 4

μῖται καλεῖσθαι. Ὁ δὲ ἄγγελος τῆς πατρὸς, ὁ υἱὸς ἐστίν, αὐτὸς Κύριος καὶ Θεὸς ὢν. Γέγραπται γάρ, Μεγάλῃς Βουλῇς Ἄγγελος. "The Son [say They] " is sometimes call'd an *Angel*, sometimes *Lord*, sometimes *God*: For it is impious to imagin that the *God of the Universe* is any where call'd an *Angel*: But the *Angel* [or Messenger] of the Father, is the *Son*, who himself is *Lord* and *God*; for it is written, *the Angel of his great Counsel*." *Epist. Synodic. ad Paul. Samosat.* This also is the Sense of *Athanasius*, *Hilary*, *Basil*, and *Cyril of Jerusalem*. And the Learned Bishop *Bull* affirms it to be the Unanimous Opinion of all Primitive Antiquity. See Dr *Clarke's Serip. Doct.* pag 102, 103, 104, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118. And the same Learned Bishop *Bull* observes, *Cap. 3. Sect. 4. Defens. Fid. Nic.* that some ancient Creeds apply'd the Words, *invisibilem & impassibilem*, after *omnipotentem* in the Apostles Creed, to the Father. And he ingenuously confesseth, that finding it to be the Sense of the whole Primitive Church, that *God the Father* was invisible and impassible, and the *Son of God* visible and passible, it was a great stumbling Block unto Him, and had well nigh made Him reject the *ὁμολογία*, or *Confession* of the Substantiality of the Son with the Father.

Christ. And therefore *Jehova* being said to do any Thing, or his Angel or Son being said to do it, is *all one*. This having not been sufficiently consider'd by learned Men, hath occasion'd a Misinterpretation of the Scriptures of both the *Old* and *New* Testament, to the Confusion of the divine Persons, and introducing *Sabellianism* in many Places into the Church: But being rightly understood, they are clearly reconcil'd to the *Personal Unity* of the one Supreme *Jehova* spoken of throughout the *Old* Testament, or the *One God the Father* mention'd throughout the *New*, reveal'd in *Both* by his Messenger or Son Jesus Christ, who was sent and commission'd by Him to declare and fulfil his Will. And therefore tho' the *Name*, i. e. the *Power* [or, as the Chaldee hath it, the *Word*] of *Jehova* was in Him, *Exod.* 23, 21; yet he cou'd not be in his own Person the Supreme *Jehova*, or the *One God*, whose *Angel* and *Son* He was, and by whom he was sent; but a distinct, subordinate, intelligent Agent or Person. Hence we learn how it comes to be true, that God is absolutely *invisible*, and that his *Voice* is never heard, according to *Job.* 1, 18. 1 *Tim.* 6, 16. *Job.* 5, 37. and yet that He appear'd and spake to the Patriarchs, to *Moses* and the Prophets, viz. by the *Schechinah* or visible Glory, and the Voice of his Angel the *Logos*. Wherefore our Lord tells *Philip*, that he that had seen Him, had seen the Father, i. e. the Power of the Father manifested by the Works which he [the Son] did in his Name, *Job.* 14. 9. Thus the Lord [*Jehova* represented by his Angel] rain'd upon *Sodom* and *Gomorrha*, *Fire* and *Brimstone* from the Lord [*Jehova*, or the *One God the Father*,] out of Heaven, *Gen.* 19, 24. Thus

the Jews tempted Christ [representing the Supreme *Jehova*,] 1 Cor. 10, 9. and therefore they spake against (or tempted) God who sent Him, Numb. 21, 5. and the Lord [*Jehova*] v. 7. The Lord (*Jehova*) laid the Foundation of the Earth, Psal. 102, 25; Christ also laid the Foundation of the Earth, Heb. 1, 10. Not because they are one and the same individual *Jehova* under two Names, but because it is said that God created all Things by Jesus Christ, Ephes. 3, 9. and that by Him He made the Worlds, Heb. 1, 2. the One *Jehova*, or God the Father, being the Original; and Jesus Christ, his Son, the instrumental Cause. Isaias, ch. 6, 1. saw the Lord [*Jehova*] sitting upon a Throne, i. e. he saw the Glory of the Lord, or visible *Schechinah*, invested in Christ, being thereby the Image of the invisible God, Col. 1, 15. And therefore He saw the Glory, of Christ invested with the Glory of the Father; by which the coming of the Messias was reveal'd to him, Joh. 12, 41. Thus the Prophet, Isai. 40, 3. foretells that John the Baptist, prefigur'd by *Elijah*, Mal. 4, 5. shou'd prepare the Way of *Jehova*: And Hos. 1, 7. that *Jehova* wou'd have mercy on the House of Judah, and save them by *Jehova* their God, (that is, that *Jehova* himself wou'd save them, but not in his own Person:) And Zec. 2, 10. that *Jehova* wou'd dwell in the Midst of his People; and that they (the Jews) shou'd look on *Jehova* whom they had pierc'd, ch. 12, 10. All which Prophecies were fulfilled in the Person of Christ: Whose Forerunner, John the Baptist was, Mat. 3, 3. Who was born in the City of David, a Saviour, Luk. 2, 11. Who was made Flesh and dwelt amongst us, Joh. 1, 14. Who was pierc'd by the Roman Souldier, on the Cross, Joh. 19, 34. But they who argue hence, that the One

Jehova

Jehova and *Christ* are one individual Being, draw a quite wrong Inference from Scripture; which teacheth them no such Confusion of Persons, but plainly informs them that God, by sending his Son into the World, *visited his People*, Luk. 7, 16. and, by sending the Spirit of his Son into the Church, *dwelleth in them*, 2 Cor. 6, 16. and *hath set up his Tabernacle amongst men*, Rev. 21, 3. and, by raising up for us an *Horn of Salvation in the House of his Servant David*, Luk. 1, 69; *hath redeemed us not with corruptible Things, but with the precious Blood of Christ*, 1 Pet. 1; 18, 19. and that he is *God our Saviour*, Luk. 1, 47; by exalting his Son to be a *Prince and a Saviour*, Acts. 5, 31. And if God said by the Prophet concerning his People, *He that toucheth you, toucheth the Apple of his Eye*, Zec. 2, 8. and our Lord, *He that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me*, Luk. 10, 16. the Sufferings of *Christ*, might well be call'd the Sufferings of *Jehova*, being pierc'd in *Effigie* in his Son who is the express *Image of his Person*, Heb. 1, 3. But Dr Clarke hath observ'd further, in his *Second Letter to a Clergyman in the Country*, that with Regard to the Words of Zech. ch. 12, 10; *They shall look on me whom they pierc'd*, (they being cited by St John thus, *they shall look on Him whom they pierc'd*; and the following Words of Zechary being, *they shall mourn for Him*;) it is probable that the Word *ME* in Zechary may be an Error of the Transcribers, the Difference in Hebrew being only ' and 1.

Qu. 1st.

Whether, if the Name Jehova be the Characteristick and distinguishing Title appointed by God to put his People always in Mind of Him, as is declar'd, Exod. 3, 15, compared with

Psal.

Pfal. 135, 13, and Hof. 12, 5. it can be communicated to Another, without losing the End of its Primitive Institution; since such a Communication must represent some other Being, no less than the true God; and render it impossible for us to discern which of the two is meant, by any other Ways than from the Circumstances of the Expression: Which Circumstances wou'd qualify any other Term for the Name of Distinction, as well as Jehova: Which is contrary to the express Letter of Scripture as above cited, which affirms of Jehova alone, that it is his Name and Memorial. Therefore, whether Jehova be not an incommunicable Name?

Whether the incommunicable distinguishing Name Jehova, be not clearly apply'd to our Lord Jesus Christ in the above-mention'd Scriptures of the Old Testament, as compar'd with those out of the New; and whether therefore our Lord Jesus Christ must not be the individual supreme Being, whose incommunicable distinguishing Name is Jehova? Qu. 2d.

According to the Explication above given, the Name Jehova is the Characteristick and personal Name, expressing and distinguishing the one supreme Self-existent Being reveal'd in the New Testament by the Title of God the Father, and therefore cannot be communicated to the Person of another; because then That other Person wou'd be also the one supreme Self-existent Being, or God the Father, distinguish'd by this Name; which is a Contradiction to the distinguishing Character of the Name Jehova, and introduceth a Confusion of Persons. But still the one supreme Being, the God and Father of All, distinguish'd by the Name Jehova, may be represented and reveal'd by another Person, who

Ans. to 1st.

who may, as a *Messenger* or *Representative*, act and speak in the Name of the one supreme Being or *Jehova*. And there can be no Danger of confounding or destroying the distinguishing Character *Jehova*, when it is expressly declar'd that another Person, tho' invested with That Title, is not Himself the one supreme *Jehova*, but the *Messenger* by whom the one supreme *Jehova* manifests Himself; That *Messenger* speaking to us in *His* Name, or personating *Him* in speaking to Us. Wherefore

Ans. to
2d.

Secondly; The incommunicable distinguishing Name *Jehova*, is not ascrib'd to the *Angel*, the *Logos* or our Lord *Jesus Christ*, as appearing in his own Name or Person, but as sent in the Name and Person of the One *Jehova* or *God the Father*; and therefore no more belongs to his distinct Person, than the Title of *King of Great Britain* belongs to the Person of the *King's Son* sent to treat in his Name. I wonder that learned Men shou'd miss this plain way of Reasoning; viz. that whatsoever one Person doth by Another acting in his Name and by his Authority, That He is said to do Himself. If a *King* is said to proclaim War, or make Peace, or execute Laws; it is thought no difficult or improper Expression, though it be known that He did not act at all immediately in Person, but only by his Ministers and Agents. Why then should it be so hard to understand what *Moses* meant, when He said, the Lord [*Jehova*] appear'd, and the Lord [*Jehova*] spake; viz. not that the One *Jehova* or *God the Father* did appear or speak immediately in his own Person, (which we are assured he did not, from the Revela-

Revelation of the New Testament;) but he appeared and spake in or by the Person of his *Angel*, the *Logos*, ΛΟΓΟΣ, or his Son *Jesus Christ*: And therefore not the Person immediately appearing and speaking, but That Person only, who spake and manifested Himself [his *Power* and *Will*] by him, is the *One God* or *Jehova*. It being thus abundantly proved that the *Logos*, or our Lord *Jesus Christ*, appeared at the Delivery of the *Law*, and in the other *Manifestations* to the Patriarchs and Prophets, as the *Angel* [Messenger] and Representative of the supreme *Jehova*; he could not be Himself the supreme *Jehova* whose Angel he was, and therefore cou'd not be [ταυταεισιν] Individually consubstantial with Him; this being not only an evident Contradiction in itself, but also contrary to the Objector's Notion of the *Incommunicableness* of the Name *Jehova*. For if the Name *Jehova* is [as is proved, and the Objector, I think, will not deny it,] the particular distinguishing Character of *God the Father*, and so *incommunicable to another*; it cannot be communicated to the *Son of God*, because thereby it would be as much his particular *distinguishing* Character, as the *Father's*; that is, it would be the *One distinguishing* Character, of *two* distinct Persons; which is a manifest Contradiction. And yet some of those who make this Objection, can digest this Reasoning: For they tell us, that *Power*, expressed by παντοκρατωρ, may be the *distinguishing* Attribute of the *Father*, and yet not exclusive of the Person of the *Son*; That is to say, that the *Son* is the παντοκρατωρ, [God Supreme over all,] tho' the *Father* only, and is distinct from the *Son*, is the παντοκρατωρ [God Supreme over all.] This, I say, is a manifest

fest Contradiction: For I always thought that the *distinguishing Attributes* of a Person, belong'd only to the Person distinguish'd by them: Otherwise they would be at the same time his *distinguishing*, and yet not *distinguishing Attributes*.

Qu. 3d.

Whether two different Beings can be express'd and describ'd by the same Name, in the same absolute Manner, so as to be distinguish'd that they are two Beings? Whether therefore the two divine Persons, God the Father and the Son, being alike express'd and describ'd by the one Name Jehova, must not necessarily be acknowledg'd to be one individual Being, or else insuperable Confusion be brought into the Object of our Faith and Worship?

Ans. to
3d.

Jesus Christ, or the Son of God, being never characterized in his own Person [as the Objection supposeth him to be] with the incommunicable Name *Jehova*, which is the distinguishing and personal Character of God the Father; may easily, nay must necessarily be a distinct individual subordinate Being. And this brings no Confusion into the Object of Their Faith and Worship, who believe Him to be, what He is reveal'd, the Messenger and Son of God, not That supreme individual God whose Son and Messenger He is declar'd to be, and worship Him with That Honour, which is due to One who is exalted and appointed by his God and Father to be the Saviour and Judge of the World. But insuperable Confusion must needs be introduc'd into Their Faith and Worship, who believe Christ to be the one supreme *Jehova*, and yet to be sent by Him; to be the most high God, and yet his Angel; and wor-

ship

ship Him with *Supreme Adoration*, and as *absolutely equal* to the *Father*, and yet acknowledge that He is a *subordinate Person*, begotten or deriv'd from the *Father*, and owing his Being and all his Perfections to the *Father* as the *Alone Original and self-existent Cause*.

Whether the Prophecy, Zec. 13, 7, Awake my Sword against my Shepherd, and against the Man my Fellow, saith the Lord of Hosts; compar'd with Mat. 26, 31, All ye shall be offended because of Me this Night, for it is written, I will smite the Shepherd &c. doth not prove that the Messias or the Son of God there spoken of, and call'd the Fellow [or Equal, my] of Jehova, is not equal and [αὐτοῦ] individually consubstantial in Nature with the One supreme Jehova? Qu. 4th.

The Learned Objectors think, that the Passage cited from *Zec. 13, 7*, is a very plain Text for the *absolute Equality* of the Son of God with the Father. Their whole Argument depends upon the Meaning of the Hebrew Word *my*, spoken of Christ becoming Man; which our Translators have render'd *Fellow*, and which the Objectors suppose to mean an *Equal absolutely* in Nature. One learned Writer observes, * that the LXX have *αἰτεῖται με*; which He translates, *my Fellow-citizen*. But this Construction is neither good sense, nor for his Purpose. To stile any one, *God's Fellow-citizen*; makes God Himself, who is the King of the City, to be a *Fellow-citizen*; which is absurd. A *Fellow-citizen*, means no more than a Citizen of the same City; which one Person may be with another of a different Nature. We are *Fellow-citizens* with the Angels

Ans. to 4th.

* Considerations on Mr W—'s Historical Preface, pag. 18.

Angels of the Heavenly Jerusalem, agreeably to
Heb. 12, 22. And the Angel calls St. John,
not only his Fellow-servant [συνδουλός,] but one
of his Brethren [τῶν ἀδελφῶν,] Rev. 19, 10: Ei-
ther of which Titles, but especially the latter,
as much proves an identical Equality of Na-
ture, as Fellow or Fellow-citizen. Further, the
Text speaking of Christ becoming Man, (the
Man that is my Fellow,) will prove too much
for the Objectors. For it will not only [by
their Argument] make Christ, as Man, equal
in Nature to God; but, since He hath many
Fellows, i. e. (according to these Authors,
Equals to Him in Nature, he being anointed
with the Oyl of Gladness above his Fellows, Heb.
1, 9; this will make his Fellows also equal
in Nature to God. But the Word Fellow, be-
ing the rendering of עֲמִי in Zechary, doth
not there signify an Equal, either in Nature or
Powers; but is the same as Companion, which
is the proper Sense of עֲמִי. Sometimes
signifies a Neighbour; as twice in Lev. 6,
If a Soul sin and commit a Trespass against the
Lord, and lie unto his Neighbour, בְּעֵמִיו, —
or hath deceived his Neighbour, עֲמִיו. The
Hebrews never, I think, express the Word
Equal by עֲמִי, but by the Verb שׁוּה. Thus
Isai. 46, 5, To whom will ye liken me and make
me equal, וְשׁוּהוּ? And 40, 25, to whom will
ye liken me, or shall I be equal, וְשׁוּהוּ? So that, un-
less the Word Fellow, as it is the same with Com-
panion or Neighbour, implies always necessarily
an Equal in Nature, [which I think these learn-
ed Authors will not affirm,] it will not prove
an identical Equality of Nature betwixt God and
Christ in this Passage of Zechary. An Angel
was the Companion of Tobias; and the good An-
gels keep Company with the Righteous, accord-

according to Tobit 5, 21. We may walk with God, as Enoch and Abraham did, Gen. 5; 22, 24. 17, 1; and so may be said to be עֲמִיתֵי ה' Companions of God: And we are said to be οἰκῆτορες τοῦ θεοῦ, of the Household [of the Family, or of the Kindred] of God, Ephes. 2, 19. And yet surely this doth not make us of absolutely Equal Nature [either ταυτοῦστοι or ὁμοούστοι] with God. Therefore the Word ὁμοῦ in Zechary can mean no more, than that the Messias was the Companion or Neighbour, or (as Abraham, tho' in a much more eminent manner,) the Friend of God; being his beloved Son in whom He was well pleas'd, Mat. 3, 17.

TEXTS propos'd to prove an [individual] Unity of Godhead in the Father and the Son.

ISA I. 45, 5. *I am the Lord, and there is none else; there is no God besides Me.*

Isa. 44, 8. *Is there a God besides me? Yea, there is no God, I know not any.*

Isa. 46, 9. *I am God, and there is none like Me; before Me there was no God form'd, neither shall there be after Me.*

Joh. 1, 1. *The Word was God.*

Heb. 1, 8. *Thy Throne, O God.*

Rom. 9, 5. *Christ came, who is over all God blessed for ever.*

Phil. 2, 6. *Who being in the Form of God.*

Heb. 1, 3. *Who being the Brightness of his Glory, and the express Image of his Person.*

CONSIDERATIONS

on the foregoing Texts.

THE Texts cited from *Isaiah* in the first Column, are spoken of *one Person only*, namely the one supreme Being reveal'd in the New Testament by the particular Title of *God the Father*. This is prov'd from *Job*. 8, 54, *It is my Father that honoureth Me, of whom ye say that HE is your God.* *Mat*. 22 ; 31, 32, *have you not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, &c;* compar'd with *Acts*. 3, 13, *the God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob, the God of our Fathers bath glorify'd HIS Son Jesus, &c.* This is further confirm'd by Texts analogous to those of *Isaiah*, limited to the Person of the Father singly ; *Job*. 17, 3, *Thee (the Father) the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.* *1 Cor*. 8, 6, *To us there is but one God, the Father &c.* *Ephes*. 4, 6, *One God and Father of all.* In these and many other Places, the one God is the Person of the Father, in Contradistinction to the Person of the Son, or our Lord Jesus Christ : Whence it unavoidably follows in Reason, that if Jesus Christ or any other Person be call'd God in Scripture, it must be in a *subordinate* Sense. And that This is so is in fact reveal'd concerning our Lord and Saviour ; See *Job*. 1, 1, cited by the Objectors, *The Word was with God, (the Father.)* compar'd with v. 14, *We beheld his Glory, the Glory*

Unity of God.

39

as of the only-begotten of the Father &c. Also Heb. 1; 8, 9, Thy Throne O God, --; wherefore God, even thy God hath anointed Thee --; compar'd with Joh. 10, 36, say ye of Him whom the Father hath sanctify'd and sent into the World --? Whence necessarily follows the Inference of St Paul, Heb. 7, 7, Without all Contradiction, the less is blessed of the greater. With Rom. 9, 5; compare 1 Cor. 15; 27, 28. He is excepted which did put all Things under Him --: Then shall the Son Himself be subject unto Him that put all Things under Him, that God (viz. the Father, for so the Context necessarily requires) may be all in all. Compare also the Words of our Lord Himself, Mat. 28, 18; All Power is given to Me in Heaven and Earth. The two Passages, Phil. 2, 6; and Heb. 1, 3; prove the direct contrary to that for which they are alledg'd; and therefore I wonder they shou'd be offer'd by a learned Person. It shall suffice to give the Sense of them in the Words of Novatian, and the learned Eusebius of Casarea. Novatian speaking of the former Place, Philip. 2, 6; saith of the Son, that tho' He was in the Form of God, yet *nunquam se Deo Patri aut comparavit aut contulit*. "He never compar'd Himself with God his Father." cap. 17. De Trin. Which is his Sense, and the true, tho' not Grammatical Sense of ἐχ ἀφραγυὸν ἡγύνατο τὸ εἶναι ἰσὺ θεῷ (a). He declares of God the Father, that He is Deus

D 2

sum^a

(a) ἐχ ἀφραγυὸν ἡγύνατο τὸ εἶναι ἰσὺ θεῷ, he did not affect, did not claim, did not assume, did not take upon him, [or eagerly desire] to be honour'd as God: This is the most proper and natural Sense of the Expression, and is acknowledg'd by Grotius, Arch Bishop Tillot-

summus, dum extra comparem est; et ideo solum et unum esse necesse est, cui conferri nihil potest, dum eparem non habet: "the supreme God, having no Compear; and therefore is necessarily the one and only God, to whom nothing can be compar'd, there being none equal to Him." That the Father and Son
(b) duo

son, Dr Whitby, and Dr Clarke. The Phrase *ἐκ αἰσχυρῶν ἡγούμενοι*, is a Metaphor taken from the Action of those who pillage or scramble for any Thing, which is always with Eagerness and Greediness of Mind. The whole Passage of *Novatian* clearly shows the above-mention'd Interpretation to be His Sense of the Words: *Hic ergo quamvis esset in Forma Dei, non est rapinam arbitratus æqualem se Deo esse. Quamvis enim se ex Deo Patre Deum esse meminisset, nunquam se Deo Patri aut comparavit aut contulit; memor se esse ex suo Patre, et hoc ipsum quod est, habere se, quia Pater dedisset. Inde deniq; et ante Carnis Assumptionem, sed et post Assumptionem Corporis, post ipsam præterea Resurrectionem, omnem Patri in omnibus rebus Obedientiam præstitit pariter ac præstat. Ex quo probatur nunquam arbitratam illum esse rapinam quandam Divinitatem, ut æquaret se Patri Deo: Quinimo contra, omni ipsius Imperio et Voluntari obediens atq; subjectus, etiam ut formam servi susciperet, contentus fuit, hoc est, hominem illum fieri, &c. De Trinit. cap. 17.* "Christ (saith He) tho' He was in the Form of God, yet did not catch at being Equal with God; for tho' he knew that He was God as having God for his Father, yet he never compar'd himself with God his Father; remembering that He was from, his Father, and that he receiv'd his very being what he was (*viz.* God) from his Father. Wherefore both before and after his taking up- on him humane Flesh, and also after his Resurrection, he always did and does pay all Obedience to his Father. From whence it appears that he never thought fit so to claim to himself Divinity, [according to the literal Sense of the Words; He never thought the Divinity a Thing to be so catch'd at by Him,] "as to equal himself with God his Father: Nay on the contrary, He was always obedient to his whole Will and Pleasure, even so as to be content to take up- on him the Form of a Servant, that is. to become a Man." See a full Account of this Phrase in Dr Clarke's *Scrip. Doct.* Pag 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181.

(b) *duo aequales inventi, duos Deos merito reddidissent*; "being found equal, wou'd undoubtedly be two Gods." A most strong Testimony against an absolute Co-equality. With Respect

D 3

to

(b) *Novatian* spends his 31st Chapter, to prove that God the Father and the Son make not *two Gods*, because the Son is not *Equal* to the Father. I shall here set down the Sum of that most remarkable Chapter, as it stands collected by the learned *Dr Clarke* in his excellent *Answer to Mr Nelson's Friend*, Pag. 138, 139. *Æquatione in utroq; ostensa, duos faceret innatos; et ideo duos faceret Deos, — Æquales inventi duos Deos reddidissent. — Par expressus, duos invisibiles ostendisset, et ideo duos comprobasset et Deos. — Nunc autem — dum se Patri in Omnibus obtemperantem reddit, quamvis sit et Deus, unum tamen Deum Patrem de Obedientia sua ostendit, ex quo et Originem traxit: et ideo duos facere non potuit, quia nec duas Origines fecit. — Subjectis enim ei quasi Filio, omnibus rebus a Patre; dum ipse cum his, quæ illi subjectæ sunt, Patri suo subjicitur; Patri quidem sui filius probatur, cæterorum autem et Dominus et Deus. — Deus quidem ostenditur Filius, cui Divinitas tradita et porrecta conspicitur; et tamen nihilo minus unus Deus Pater probatur, dum gradatim reciproco meatu illa Majestas atq; Divinitas ad Patrem, qui dederat eam, rursus ab illo ipso Filio missa revertitur et retorquetur. Ut merito Deus Pater, omnium Deus sit, et principium ipsius quoque filii sui quem Dominum genuit; Filius autem cæterorum omnium Deus sit, quoniam omnibus illum Deus Pater præposuit quem genuit. Ita Mediator Dei et Hominum Christus Jesus, omnis Creaturæ subjectam sibi habens a Patre proprio Potestatem, qua Deus est; cum tota Creatura subdita sibi, concors Patri tuo Deo conveniens, unum et solum et verum Deum Patrem suum — breviter approbavit: "It (saith He) they were Both Equal, they would Both be unoriginate, and consequently two Gods. — Being found Equal, they would be Two Gods. — Being Equal, they would be Two Invisibles, and consequently Two Gods. But now, whilst the Son obeys his Father in all Things; tho' He himself also be God, yet by his Obedience He declares his Father to be the One God, from whom also He derives his Original; and therefore He cou'd not make Two Gods, because He did not make Two Original Principles." — [Here *Dr Clarke* notes, that a corrupt Passage, *inequalitate* instead of *in Æqualitate*, comes in, cited by Mr *Nelson's Friend* to a Purpose quite opposite to the Author's Design in his whole Chapter.] "For all Things being made subject to Him as Son, by his Father; He himself together with all Things under Him, being subject to his Father, is prov'd to be the Son ind*

D 3

" 3

to the latter Place, *Heb. 1, 3*; *Euseb. cont. Marc. pag. 25*, directly affirms, ὁ υἱὸς ὁμοεικὼν, καὶ τὸ ἐξ ἐστὶν ἡ εἰκὼν, ἐν καὶ ταυτὸ ἐργασίαι· ἀλλὰ δύο μὲν ὁσίου, καὶ δύο πρᾶγματά, καὶ δύο δυνάμεις:
 “ The Image, and That of which it is the
 “ Image, can never be understood to be one
 “ and the same Thing; but they are two Sub-
 “ stances, and two Things, and two Powers: ”
 Plainly inconsistent and opposite to individual
 Consubstantiality. To conclude this Head;
 I desire the Texts may be consider'd, wherein
 God is stil'd the *God and Father of our Lord*
Jesus Christ: Wherein the Son is said to live
 by the Father's Donation of Life to Him; I
 live by the Father, *Joh. 6, 57*; and, *As the Fa-*
ther hath Life in Himself, so hath he given to
the Son to have Life in Himself, *Joh. 5, 26*;
 and, *That He can do nothing but what He seeth*
the Father do, (that is, what he hath receiv'd
 Power and Commission to do, as the Father's
 Minister and Agent,) *Joh. 5. 19*: In short;
 where 'tis said that his Being and all his At-
 tributes are deriv'd from the Gift and good Plea-

“ of the Father, but of all other Things the *Lord and God*.—The Son
 “ indeed is shown to be God, because Divinity is communicated and
 “ deriv'd to Him; and yet the Father nevertheless is prov'd to be
 “ the *One God*, whilst That Majesty and Divinity, which the Father
 “ communicates to the Son, is by the Son in Acknowledgment con-
 “ tinually return'd back to the Father who gave it: So that God
 “ the Father is justly stil'd; *The God over All*; and the *Original* ever
 “ of the Son himself, whom He begat Lord of all: And at the same
 “ Time the Son is the God of all other Things, because God the
 “ Father made all Things subject to Him whom He begat. Thus Je-
 “ sus Christ the Mediatour between God and Men, having from his
 “ Father all Creatures subjected to him as their God; himself with
 “ the whole Creation under his Dominion, being in perfect Agree-
 “ ment with God his Father, hath briefly shown his Father to be
 “ *The One and Only and True God*.

Pleasure of the Father; according to that of the Apostle, Col. 1, 19, *It pleas'd the Father, that in Him should all Fulness dwell*: Particularly, That remarkable Passage, *Joh, 14, 28. My Father is greater than I*: (c) Which all the antient *antenicene*, and some *Nicene* and *post-nicene* Fathers understand to be spoken of Christ as the *Logos* or Son of God. I desire that these Texts may be reconcild to an individual Consubstantiality and Coequality, without any Sophistry or Equivocation. This being premis'd concerning the Texts, I proceed to reply to the *Queries*.

Whether all other Beings besides the one supreme God, be not excluded by the Texts of Isaiah; and consequently whether Christ can be any God at all, unless He be the same with the supreme God? Qu. 1st

That there is or can be but one supreme Being or God, is the first Principle of natural as well as reveal'd Religion. That this one supreme Being or God is reveal'd to be one Person, the Person of the Father; is prov'd from the Texts of *Isaiab* (as I have shown,) compar'd with the Tenour of the New Testament. Therefore all other Persons or Beings, how di-

Ans. to 1st.

D 4

wine

(c) This, Dr Clarke hath shewn to be the Sense of *Justin Martyr*, *Irenaeus*, *Origen*, *Alexander Bishop of Alexandria*, the Synod of *Sardica*, *Marius Victorinus*, *Hilary*, *Athanasius*, *Basil*, *Nazianzen*. And our own learned Bishop Bull acknowledgeth that the Subordination of the Son to the Father, even with Respect to his Godhead, (it being deriv'd from the Father,) is the Catholick Faith, and maintain'd by the most Orthodox Fathers after the Council of *Nice*. See *Script. Doct. Pag. 157, 158, 159, 160, 161*.

vine soever, are necessarily excluded; And by Consequence our Lord *Jesus Christ* is as much excluded from being the one supreme God, as from being the Person of the Father. The Question, *whether Christ can be any God at all, unless He be the same with the supreme God*; is exactly the same as if it were ask'd, Whether the Person of Christ can be God at all, unless He be the Person of the Father; Which I presume needs no Answer. Indeed, on the contrary, if Christ be God at all, it unavoidably follows that He cannot be the same individual God, with the supreme God, the Father; for then He plainly wou'd be no God at all, but only another Name of the one God the Father; Which is contrary to Reason and the whole Tenour of Revelation.

Qu. 2d. *Whether the Texts of the New Testament do not shew, that He is not excluded; and therefore must be the same God?*

Qu. 3d. *Whether the Word (God) in Scripture, can reasonably be suppos'd to carry an ambiguous Meaning, or to be us'd in a different Sense, when apply'd to Father and Son in the same Scripture, and even in the same Verse? See Joh. 1, 1.*

Ans. to
2d. and
3d.

The Word (God) in Scripture hath a relative Signification; and is us'd in a supreme and in a subordinate Sense. It is ascrib'd to other Beings, besides the one God. See *Exod. 7, 1; I have made thee a God to Pharoah. Psal. 82, 1; God standeth in the Assembly of Gods, He judgeth among Gods. He is God of Gods, &c. Compare Joh. 10; 34, 35, Is it not written in your Law, I said ye are Gods? — If He call'd them Gods to whom the Word of God came, &c. And this relative subordinate Signification holds, tho' not*

not equally, when *Christ* is call'd *God*; as appears from the very Passages cited by the Objector. He who being God, calls another *his God*, and is *sanctify'd by Him*, Heb. 1; 8, 9; must needs be God in a *subordinate* Sense, and in Contradistinction to the supreme Being, *his God*. Again; He who is God, and, at the same time, is *with God* who begat Him, *Joh.* 1; 1, 14; must needs be God in a *different* Meaning, unless the same God could be *with Himself*, and *beget Himself*; which is an evident Contradiction. I may add, that, with Regard to *Joh.* 1, 1, refer'd to by the learned Objector, the Article is prefix'd before *θεός* in an absolute Construction spoken of the Father, but omitted when predicated of the *λόγος*: And 'tis a Difference of Stile, which runs thro' the whole New Testament without one Exception; (the Passage, *Acts.* 20, 28, will not be objected by any one, who considers that the Text is read otherwise by *Irenæus*, the ancient *Syriac* Version, and the most correct *Alexandrian* MS:) (d.) Nor will a Scholar call this Remark trifling, who knows that the three most learned antenicene Greek Fathers, (e) *Clem. Alex.* (f) *Origen*,

(d) In all these, it is read, *the Church of the Lord*.

(e) εἰ γὰρ θεὸν ἀπλῶς προσεῖπεν, ὁ τῇ τῷ ἄρθρῳ προτάξει ἢ πανκράτορα δηλώσας: *Clem. Alex. Strom.* 3. p. 400, "He calls him (Christ) not absolutely God with an Article, by which the supreme God (the Father) is signify'd."

(f) ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ὀνομασία ἐπὶ τῷ ἀγννήτῳ τίσεται ἢ ὅλων αἰνῶν, τίθησι μὲν τὸ ἄρθρον· σιωπᾷ δὲ αὐτὸ, ὅτι ὁ λόγος θεὸς ὀνομάζεται. *Orig. Comment. in Joh.* p. 46, 47. "The Apostle (He saith) adds the Article, when the Word God is put for the unbecotten Cause of all Things (or the Father,) but He omits it when the Word is call'd God?" And again: πᾶν δὲ τὸ παρὰ τὸ αὐτό, μετὰ τῆς ἐκείνου θεότητος θεοποιήματος, καὶ ὁ θεός, ἀπαλὸς κυριώτερον ἂν λέγοιτο. *Orig. ibidem.* "but whatsoever is
" God

Origen, (g) Euseb. Cæsar. insist upon it: And I think it no impertinent Observation, that the Stile of the LXXII, in all the Places alledg'd above for the subordinate Sense of the Word (God,) is exactly agreeable hereto.

Qu. 4th. *Whether, if the Scripture-Notion of God be no more than that of the Author and Governour of the Universe, or whatever it be; the admitting of Another to be Author and Governour of the Universe, be not admitting another God, contrary to the Texts cited from Isaiah; and also to Isa. 42, 8.—48, 11; where He declares, He will not give his Glory to another?*

Ans. to
4th.

Supposing the reveal'd Sense of the Word (God) to imply *Dominion*, and that he is the *Author and Governour of the Universe*, as Dr Clarke doth hold; the admitting a *Second Person*, distinct from the one supreme God, to be *Author and Governour*, doth by no means contradict the Passages cited from *Isa.* or any other; or introduce two Gods, viz. two supreme Beings or Persons: But is easily reconcil'd to Reason and Scripture, by proving, (as I have already done and will more fully hereafter,) that the *second Person* was subordinate to and the *Agent* of the First, in the Work of Creation. If there is (as is on all Sides acknowledged)

* God besides that Self-existent Person, (*the Father, spoken of immediately before;*) being so only by Communication of his Divinity, cannot so properly be call'd That God; but rather a divine Person. " See Dr Clarke's *Scrip. Doct.* Pag. 4, 5.

(g) Dr Clarke hath observed, that *Eusebius* makes the same Remark concerning the Article being prefix'd to *θεός*, by *St John* when apply'd to the *Father*; but omitted, when ascrib'd to the *Word or Son*. See his *Answer to Mr Nelson's Friend*, Pag. 67.

And knowledg'd, but one *νοῦς, πῦρ, πῖζα*, one Original, Fountain, and Cause of all Power &c; then it is impossible that there shou'd be any more than one God in the highest and absolute Sense of the Word; and it can never be a Contradiction to this Unity, that any other Being is call'd God, which is necessarily subordinate. And therefore tho' the one supreme God, creates and governs the World by the Ministry of one or more Agents; this one, or these Agents, may in a subordinate Sense be truly called the Creator, or Creators, and Governours of the Universe; and yet is there plainly but one Creator and Governour in the highest and proper Sense. As for God declaring, *that He will not give his Glory to another*, Isa. 42, 8; — 48, 11; it hath no Difficulty. God neither will, nor can give his Glory to another: His Glory is (as hath been said,) his being the one supreme independent Cause and Original of all Things or Beings; and whatever Divine Honour is justly given to any other, redounds ultimately to the Glory of Him who commanded it to be given.

Whether Dr Clarke's Pretence, that the Au-Qu. 5th.
thority of Father and Son being one, tho' they are two distinct Beings, makes them not to be two Gods, as a King upon the Throne, and his Son administering the Father's Government are not two Kings; *be not trifling and inconsistent? For if the King's Son be not a King, He cannot truly be call'd King; if He is, then there are two Kings: So if the Son be not God in the Scripture notion of God, He cannot truly be call'd God; and then how is the Dr consistent with Scripture or with himself? But if the Son be truly God, there are two Gods upon the Doctors Hypothesis, as plainly as that one and one are two.*

two. And so all the Texts of Isa. cited above, besides others, stand full and clear against the Doctor's Notion.

Answ. to
5.

I trust, the learned Objector, upon a second Consideration of his 5th Querie, will not think it very pertinent or conclusive; He will not ask a second Time, whether one Divine Person exercising the Authority of Another, to whom He is *subordinate*, and by whom He is sent, proves that the two Persons are *two Gods*. He knows that the proper Unity of God, is a *personal Unity* of Supremacy and Independency; and consequently that any *other* divine Being, must have the Name of *God* in a *subordinate* Sense. So that 'tis plainly to ask, whether there can be a divine Person, to exercise the Power or Authority of the *one supreme God*; without such Person's being another distinct *co-ordinate Person* or *God*. Divine Power, can easily be conceiv'd communicable but *personal Supremacy* and *Independency*, cannot: And if the Exercise of *divine Power*, makes any Person to have justly given to him the Title of *God*; Jesus Christ, who hath all communicable divine Powers, plainly is *God*; and yet not *another God* in Opposition to the *Unity of the one supreme God*, his *Father and God*. So that the Texts in *Isa.* and elsewhere, are very secure; and *Dr Clarke's* Meaning, clear and consistent. The Doctor's Way of arguing from a *King* upon the Throne, and his *Son* administering the Father's Government, invested with the Title of *King* in *Subordination* to his Father; hath the Authority of *Tertulian* and *Athenagoras*, (b) and is agreeable to right Reason:

(b) See *Scrip. Doct.* pag. 333, 334, 346, 347.

Son: And I ask whether Herod the Great was not King of Judea, tho' the Jews had no King but Caesar? And whether there were more Kings of Persia than One, though the King of Persia was King of Kings.

TEXTS to prove an Unity of Divine Attributes in the Father and the Son.

Apply'd to the one God.

And to the Son.

KINGS 8, 39. *Thou, even thou only, knowest the Hearts of all the Children of Men.*

Joh. 2, 24. *He knew all Men &c.*

Jer. 17, 10. *I the Lord search the Heart, I try the Reins.*

Joh. 16, 30. *Thou knowest all Things.*

Acts 1, 24. *Which knowest the Hearts of all Men.*

Rev. 2, 23. *I am he that searcheth the Reins and the Heart.*

Isa. 44, 6. *I am the first, and I am the last; and besides Me there is no God.*

Rev. 1, 17. *I am the first, and I am the last.*

Rev. 1, 8. *I am A and Ω, the Beginning and the End.*

Rev. 22, 13. *I am A and Ω, the Beginning and the End.*

1 Tim. 6, 15. *King of Kings and Lord of Lords.*

Rev. 17, 14.—19, 16. *He is Lord of Lords, and King of Kings.*

Isai. 10, 21. *The mighty God.*

Isa. 9, 6. *The mighty God.*

Rom. 10, 12. *Lord over all.*

Acts. 10, 36. Rom. 9, 5. *He is Lord of all.*

CON-

CONSIDERATIONS

*On the foregoing Texts, relating to
the Divine Attributes.*

THE Texts offer'd on this Head of Argument from the *Old Testament*, prove, agreeably to the Tenour of the *New*, that God even the Father, the one supreme Being, is the Fountain and Original, as of all Being, so of all Power, Knowledge &c. Hence all Powers and Attributes, are said to be *His only*; because they belong to *Him primarily*, or originally, as the Self-existent Cause. But our Lord *Jesus Christ*, having all communicable Divine Powers deriv'd to Him with his Being from the Father, is said to do the same Things which the Father doth, and to be, in a subordinate Sense, what the Father is; because whatever the Father doth with respect to the Creatures, this he doth by his Son &c. So also the Son doth them, because He hath all Power necessary thereto, given to Him by the Father; and acts in Subordination to the Father, who is supreme. With the Text cited by the learned Objector, compare *Mat. 19, 17; There is none good, but One, that is God* (say all the * Antenicene Writers, the Father

* *Justin Martyr* reads the Words thus; " *There is one Good, ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, My Father which is in Heaven;* " *Dial. cum Tryph.*

Yet *Angels* are good, and the *Son* and *holy Spirit* more perfectly so; but none of these, is the supreme *αὐτοαγαθόν*, *Underived Good*. Again, *Tim.* 6; 15, 16, *He, is the only Potentate*, — only bath *Immortality*: Yet there are other *Thrones* and *Dominions*, *Principalities* and *Powers*, which are also *immortal*: And above all these, is the *Son of God*; yet *HE* is excepted, which did put all *Things* under *Him*, and is above the *Son* Himself, as being the *Alone Fountain of Immortality and Power*. See also *Rom.* 2, 16, in the *Day when God shall judge the Secrets of all Men by Jesus Christ &c.* Hence *Kings.* 8, 39; *Jer.* 17, 10; are clearly reconcil'd with *Joh.* 16, 30; *Rev.* 2, 22: without making the *Son of God* individual with *God the Father*. And when *Christ* is stil'd *Lord of all*; see it explain'd, *Mat.* 28, 18; *all Power* is given to me both in *Heaven* and *Earth*: And *Ephes.* 1, 22; and bath put all *Things* under his *Feet*, and gave him to be *Head* over all *Things* to the *Church*: Yet still the *Head of Christ, is God*, *1 Cor.* 11, 3.

Whether

Tryph. pag. 328. Thus also *Irenæus*, *Lib.* 1. c. 17. And *Clem. Alexand.* proves from this Place, that *θεός ὁ πατήρ, εἷς ὁ μόνος ἀνάρχων ἀπαρχή*, "God the Father, is the one and only supreme Potentate;" *Strom.* 7. P. 733. And *Origen*, *ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν καὶ κύριος, ὡς ποτὲ, διδάσκαλε ἀγαθὲ, ἀναπεμπὼν τὸν λέγοντα τῷ ἐπὶ τὸν αὐτὸν πατέρα, οἷοι τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν; ἴδεῖς ἀγαθὸς, εἰ μὴ εἰς, ὁ θεὸς ὁ πατήρ;* "Our Lord and Saviour [says He,] when a certain Person call'd Him, *Good Master*, refer'd back the Person to his Father, saying, *why callest thou me good? There is none good but one, that is God the Father;*" *Contr. Cels.* *Lib.* 5. and thus likewise in many other Places. And *Novatian*: *quem solum merito bonum pronunciat Dominus;* "whom our Lord (says He) deservedly pronounces to be *Alone Good?*" *De Trin.* *Cap.* 4. See *Dr Clarke's Serip.* *Dof.* pag. 50, 51, 52.

Qu. 1st. *Whether the same Characteristicks, especially such eminent ones, can reasonably be understood of two distinct Beings? and of one, infinite and independent; the other, dependent and finite?*

Ans. to 1st. The Characteristick Attributes mention'd in Scripture, may be understood, agreeably to Reason, of *two* distinct Beings, in the Sense in which I have explain'd them; of the one, as supreme and underiv'd; of the other, as subordinate and deriv'd. The Exercise of these Attributes being finite, they do not necessarily infer an infinite Subject in which to subsist, tho' it is undoubtedly true, that all the Attributes of the *one* supreme God are in Him necessarily infinite, and by consequence so is the Nature in which they subsist.

Qu. 2d. *Whether the Father's Omniscience and Eternity are not one and the same with the Son's; being alike describ'd, and in the same Phrases?*

Ans. to 2d. The Son hath a *relative* Omniscience communicated to him from the Father; I mean, that He knoweth all Things relating to the Creation and Government of the Universe: But yet He himself confesseth, *Mat. 24, 36, of that Day and Hour (of the last and general Judgment) knoweth no Man, no not the Angels of Heaven, but my Father only: Mark 13, 32 Neither the Son, but the Father.* By which All the ancient † antenicene Writers understand

† The Comment of Irenaeus cited by Dr Clarke, *Scrip. Doct.* p. 146, 147, is very remarkable. Dominus ipse Filius Dei, ipsum Judicium concessit scire solum Patrem &c. "Our Lord himself

that our Lord, as the *λογος*, or Son of God, did not then know the Day of Judgment. As to the Son's Eternity being alike described, and in the same Phrases with that of the Father; the Son's metaphysical Eternity is no where expressly reveal'd either in the Old or New Testament. The learned Objector hath not brought one Text of Scripture, that at all proveth it. However, I will save Him some Trouble, by acknowledging, that in the Hebrew Language of the Old Testament, the Words by which is express'd the Eternity of God, are ascrib'd to the *Messias* and *Wisdom*: But then I affirm, and will prove, if He pleaseth to put me to it, that in all the Places He can alledge, Reason and the Context shews, that the metaphysical Eternity of the *Messias* or *Wisdom*, is not or cannot be there spoken of. The Truth is; the Hebrew Language is herein deficient, and hath not any Word which properly and emphatically denoteth what we mean by *simple Eternity*. The Words by which it is express'd, are all ambiguous, and signify equally a limited or unlimited Duration. If
E it

"He,] the Son of God acknowledg'd that the Father only knew the Day (and Hour) of Judgment." As a very learned Person observes; this Passage of *Irenæus* will admit of no Evasion. For He evidently speaks not of the Son of Man, but of the Son of God; even of That Son, with whom, as it follows, in *omnibus Pater communicat*, "the Father communicates in all Things." Presently after, having cited the Words of our Lord, *My Father is greater than I*, he concludes; *Secundum agnitionem itaq; prepositus esse Pater annuntiatus est a Domino nostro*, "The Father therefore is by our Lord declar'd to be superiour even in Knowledge also to Him;" *Lib. 2. Cap. 48, 49.* Basil himself acknowledgeth, that "he had ever been taught by Tradition from his Forefathers, that God the Father was the Fountain of Knowledge, and that the Son receiv'd his Knowledge with his Essence from Him." See *Scrip. Doct.* pag. 147, 148, 149.

it be hence objected, that we cannot certainly know, whether the Eternity of *God the Father* be reveal'd or no in the Old Testament: to That I answer, that tho' we cou'd not, yet *Reason*, as sure and prior to That Revelation, makes us not to doubt of it. There appears no Necessity at all, that the Attribute of Eternity shou'd be distinctly reveal'd with Respect to the *Father*, whose Eternity our Reason infallibly assures us of; nor with Respect to the *Son*, whose Office and Character *relative to us* presupposes not, nor is at all more perfect for, the eternal past Duration of his Being, supposing it never so certainly prov'd. As there is no Doubt, but the Eternity of *God the Father* is reveal'd in the Old Testament; there being nothing in Reason or the Context to determine the Words ascrib'd to Him, to the limited or finite Sense: so in the *New Testament*, it is emphatically express'd, *Rom. 1, 20*. But in *Neither*, is there any Mention of the *Son's*.

Qu. 3d. *Whether Eternity does not imply necessary Existence of the Son; which is inconsistent with the Doctor's Scheme? And whether the Dr hath not made an elusive, equivocating Answer, to this Objection; since the Son may be a necessary Emanation from the Father, by the Will and Power of his Father, without any Contradiction? Will is one Thing, and arbitrary Will another.*

Ans. to 3d. *Simple and absolute Eternity, in That Sense wherein the Word is sometimes used by Metaphysicians, to signify, not barely an indefinite Duration, but the same with necessary or Self-existence; is indeed inconsistent with Dr Clarke's Scheme: but no where suppos'd or affirm'd by Him of the Son of God, any more than re-*
veal'd

deal'd in the Scriptures. 'Tis evident that, was the Son Eternal in That Sense, He wou'd be Self-existent or unbegotten; which is a flat Contradiction to his Generation, and to the whole Tenour of the Scripture. It hath ever been allow'd, that the Father is *Principium Filii*, the Original of the Son: How can this be, if the Son is eternal in That absolute and metaphysical Sense of Eternity, which hath not, nor can have, any *Principium* or *Original*? Yet I deny not, but that there is a reasonable Sense in which the Son may be said to be eternal. Dr Clarke hath clearly proved from Scripture and Antiquity, that, whatever the Son is in his metaphysical Nature, he is certainly deriv'd from the Father, and hath his Being and all his Powers by Donation from the Father: Which evidently shows, that He was brought into Existence, or begotten, by the (i) Will of

E 2

the

(i) Nothing can possibly be more clearly express'd, than the unanimous Sense of the ancient Church in this Matter; as Dr Clarke and Dr Whitby have largely shown. Christ is the Son of God, κατὰ θέλημα καὶ δύναμιν θεῶ, "by the Will and Power of God;" Ignat. ad Smyr. § 1. Ἐκείνον τὸν κατὰ βουλὴν Ἰὴν ἔχειν καὶ θεὸν ὄντα, ὕδιν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀγγελόν: "Him (saith Justin Martyr,) who by the Will of the Father, is God; the Son and Messenger of the Father." Dial. with Tryph. Again, — ἐκ τῶ ἀπὸ τῶ πατρὸς θελήσει γεννηθῆσαι, "He hath all these Titles [before-mention'd, viz. that of Son, Wisdom, Angel, God, Lord and Word,] from his being begotten of the Father, by his Will;" *ibid.* Again: καὶ πρὶ πάντων ποιημάτων ἀπὸ τῶ πατρὸς, δυνάμει αὐτοῦ καὶ βουλῇ προελθόντα, "and that he was produced from the Father, before all Creatures, by his Power and Will;" *ibid.* He is Cause of all Things, θελήματι τῶ παντοκράτορος καὶ πατρὸς, "by the Will of the Almighty Father;" Clem. Alex. Strom. 5. pag. 598. Tunc cum Deus voluit, ipsum primum protulit Sermonem, "God produced the Word Himself first, when He willed to do so;" Tertul. adv. Prax. l. 6. Θελήματι τῆς ἀπορίης αὐτοῦ προελθὼν ὁ λόγος, "the Word proceeded from the simple

the Father. What the learned Querist means by a *Necessary Emanation by the Will of the Father*, I understand not; nor what again, by the Difference of *Will* and *arbitrary Will*. I hope the Author doth not mean by a *Necessary Emanation by the Will of the Father*, that the Son's Emanation is *naturally necessary*; only being however not *contrary* to, but *agreeable* to the *Will of the Father*; For, in *This* Sense, it is evident that the *Will of the Father* doth not at all concur to the *Emanation* of the Son; nor is any more a Cause of it, than the *Will of Man* is of the Rising of the Sun, or of the Fruitfulness of the Seasons, which are *necessary* in their natural Causes, and not *contrary* to, but *agreeable* to the *Will of Man*. This, even at first Sight, appears a most *elusive and trifling Equivocation*, which an honest *Arguer* will

"simple Will of the Father;" Tatian pag. 145. *Ex quo, quando ipse voluit, sermo filius natus est: — Quando Pater voluit, processit ex Patre;* "the Word, which is the Son, was born of the Father at the Will of the Father; — he was produced by the Father at the Will of the Father," *De Trinit. c. 31.* Eusebius saith, ὁ υἱὸς κατὰ γνώμην καὶ προαίρεσιν οἰκῶν ὑπὲρ τῆ πατρὸς βεβληθεὶς γὰρ ὁ θεὸς γέγονεν υἱὸς πατρὸς. "that the Son, by the Intention and Will of the Father, received his Subsistence, so as to be the Image of the Father: For by his Will, did God become the Father of his Son;" *Demonst. Evang. Lib. 4, c. 3.* The Council of Sirmium is very peremptory in their Decision of this Matter: ὅτις μὴ θελήσαντες τῆ πατρὸς γεγενῆσθαι λέγοι τὸν υἱὸν, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. Οὐ γὰρ διαδεῖς ὁ ἀλλήλῃ, ὑπὸ ἀνάγκης φυσικῆς ἀχθεῖς, ὡς ἐκ ἐθέλησεν, ἐγέννησε τὸν υἱὸν ἀλλ' αὐτὰ τ' ἐβελήθη, καὶ — ἕξ ἑαυτοῦ αὐτὸν γενήσας ἀπέδειξε; "If any one says, that the Son was begotten without the Will of the Father, let him be Anathema. For the Father did not beget the Son by a physical Necessity of Nature, without the Operation of his Will; But He at once willed and — begat the Son from Himself;" *Anathem. 25.* This is also the Sense of Hilary, Marius Victorinus, Basil, Greg. Nyssen; as Dr Clarke hath shewn at large: See his *Scrip. Doct. Part 2. Notes on S. 17.*

will be asham'd of. And as to the vain Distinction of *arbitrary* Will: God the Father, as He is the most perfect, so he is the most *free* and *arbitrary* Being, tho' *necessarily acting* (viz. by a *moral Necessity* only) consistent with his Attributes or Perfections. And if the Object- or means, that the Son was begotten by the Will of the Father acting under a *moral Necessity*, to wit, that the Generation of the Son redounded most to the Glory of the Father; it is intelligible and reasonable: If otherwise, I desire Him to explain Himself, and I will return Him a distinct Answer.

Whether the divine Titles and Attributes, Om- Qu. 4th.
niscience, Ubiquity &c, those individual Clarke's
Attributes, can be communicated without the Reply, pag.
Divine Essence, from which they are insepara- 230.
ble?

If it be ask'd (as I think it is,) whether the *Ans. 30*
individual Divine Attributes of the one su- 4th.
preme God, can be communicated without the
individual Divine Nature in which they sub-
sist; 'tis readily answer'd, *No*; Nor was ever
any one so absurd as to affirm it. And Dr
Clarke, in the 230th Page of his *Replies* refer'd
to, hath plainly shown us that *individual At-*
tributes, Divine or not Divine, cannot possi-
bly be communicated *at all*: And therefore
the Son of God hath not the *individual Attri-*
butes of God the Father, any more than his
individual Nature or Person; For then He
must be *the Father*, and the Father nothing at
all; Which is absurd.

Whether, if they be not individually the same, Qu. 5th
they can be any Thing more than a faint Resem-
blance

blance of them, differing from them as finite from infinite? And then in what Sense, and with what Truth, can the Dr pretend that all divine Powers, except absolute Supremacy and Independency, are communicated to the Son?

Qu. 6th. Whether every Being, besides the Supreme Being, must not necessarily be a Creature and finite? And whether all Divine Powers can be communicated to a Creature; infinite Perfection, to a finite Being?

Qu. 7th. Whether, if the Dr means by Divine Powers, Powers given by God, (in the same Sense as Angelical Powers are divine Powers,) only in a higher Degree than are given to other Beings; it be not equivocating and saying Nothing, nothing that can come up to the Sense of those Texts last-cited, or of these following?

Neh. 9. 6. Thou, even Thou, art Lord alone; thou hast made Heaven, the Heaven of Heavens with all their Host, the Earth and all Things that are therein, the Seas &c.

Gen. 1. 1. In the Beginning, God created the Heavens and the Earth.

Ans. to
Qu. 5th,

Tho' the Divine Attributes of the Son, are not individually the same with those of the Father;

Joh. 1. 3. All Things were made (k) by Him.

Col. 1; 16, 17. By Him were all Things created.——He is before all Things, and by Him all Things consist.

Heb. 1, 10. Thou, Lord, in the Beginning, hast laid the Foundation of the Earth, and the Heavens are the Work of thy Hands.

(k) In all the Texts, wherein the World is said to be created by Jesus Christ; it is in the Original, *δι' αὐτοῦ* and *δι' ἑ*, never *ὁ* *αὐτοῦ* or *ὁ* *ἑ*. See Joh 1; 3, 10. Ephes. 3, 9. Col. 1, 16. Heb. 1, 2. The

ther ; yet they are more than faint Resemblan-6th, and
ces : The Son, is the Brightness of his Fathers 7th.
Glory, and the expresse Image of his Person. As for
their differing as finite and infinite ; there can
be but one intelligent Being, absolutely infinite

E 4

in

Note of Eusebius observed by Dr Clarke, Scrip. Doct. pag. 89, 90,
is very remarkable ; viz. λέγων δὲ δι' αὐτὸ γεγονῆναι τὰ
πάντα, τὸ ὑπερῆκόν τῷ θεῷ [λόγῳ] παίστησι δαδάμεν γὰρ ὁ
Εὐαγγελιστὴς εἰπεῖν, πάντα ἡμεῖς ἀναπέμψα ἐπὶ τὴν οὐρανὸν ποιητικῶς τῷ
πατρὶ αὐθεντῶν : " When the Evangelist [says He, speaking of the
Text, Joh. 1, 3.] " affirms that all Things were made [διὰ] by (or
" through) Him, He therein declares the Ministrations of Christ to God
" (the Father.) For whereas he might have expresse d it thus, all
" Things were made [ὑπὸ αὐτῷ] by Him as the efficient Cause ; he
" does not so expresse it ; but thus, all things were made [δι' αὐτῷ]
" by him as the ministring Cause ; that so he might refer us to the
" supreme Power and Efficiency of the Father, as the Maker of
" all Things ; " De Eccles. Theol. Lib. 1, c. 20. Another very lear-
ned Person takes notice, that the same Eusebius observes, that the
Evangelist [St John] doth not say, all Things were made ὑπὸ αὐτῷ,
δι' αὐτῷ, of or from Him [the Word,] but δι' αὐτῷ, by [or
through] him ; ἡ δὲ διὰ προθεσις τὸ ὑπερῆκόν σημαίνει, " now the
Preposition διὰ [By or Through] signifies the ministring Cause ; "
Mnt. Marcel. lib. 2. c. 14. The same worthy Person also remarks
from Origen, that he saith in his Comment on the third Verse of the
first Chapter of St John's Gospel ; δι' ἡμῶν τὴν πρῶτον χάριν
ἔχον, δι' ἡμῶν δὲ αὐτῶν, " the Phrase δι' ἡμῶν, By (or Through) whom,
never relates to the Principal, but always to the Second or ministe-
rial Cause ; " Comment. in Joh. pag. 55. Again ; speaking of Heb.
2 ; (wherein it is said, δι' ἡμῶν καὶ τῶν αἰώνων ἐποίησεν, By whom
the Son] also, He [God the Father] made the Worlds ;) Origen's Note
ἔχον ὑπὸ τῷ λόγῳ ἐγένετο, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ κρείττονος καὶ μείζονος πατρὸς
τῷ λόγῳ. Τίς δ' ἂν ἄλλος ἢ ὁ πατήρ ; " Tho'
all Things were made διὰ τῷ λόγῳ, by the Ministry of the Word,
yet were they not made ὑπὸ τῷ λόγῳ, by the Word as the Prin-
cipal Cause ; but by one more excellent and Greater than the Word ;
And what other can He be, but the Father ? " Ibid. pag. 56. See
the Defense of Dr Clarke against Mr Nelson's Friend, with Regard to
some

in all Respects (1); And tho' I will not limit the Perfections of the Son of God, yet I say that his Office and Character doth not absolutely in itself require infinite Powers; and herein I am willing to believe that the learned Objector agrees

some Texts as expounded by the Fathers, pag. 40, 41. This is the Sense of all Antient Antiquity; as appears by their unanimously asserting that the λόγος [the Word] did ὑπεργεῖν, ὑπερθεῖν, διακονεῖν, minister to the Father in the Creation of the World. So that the English word, By, being ambiguous in the Texts alledged, but the Greek διὰ being not so; this ought always to be taken Notice of by those who cite them. 'Tis also remarkable, that (according to the Sense of the fore-going Distinction,) though Christ is frequently stil'd by the Ancients πᾶσις and συνεργός, yet παντὶς ὄλον is, (to the best of my Remembrance,) always confined by them to the Father only.

(1) Absolutely infinite in all Respects. The Word, infinite, when taken absolutely, and apply'd to the Divine Nature; generally signifies the incomprehensible Manner of God's filling all Things; which is called his Immensity, or Omnipresence: And One infinite, in the Sense of immense, does not [by taking up all Space] exclude [necessarily] another immense, any more than it excludes any finite. God having a Power of acting wherever He is, can produce Beings every where without excluding Himself. For if a finite Being doth not exclude Him from a finite Place, 'tis plain that an infinite, that is, an immense Being, cannot exclude him from infinite, that is, from immense Place. So that perhaps it is no such absolute Impossibility as some have thought it, to suppose two distinct immense Beings. The Impossibility is, that there should be, of the same Individual Nature two Omnipresent distinct Persons or intelligent Agents: For so they must necessarily coincide, and be but One Person only. But if they be of distinct Natures, there seems to be no more Contradiction or Impossibility, absolutely in the Nature of Things, that there should be two or more immense Substances, than two finite Substances filling the same Space, as Spirit and Matter are supposed to do. This Observation (I humbly think) is worthy the Consideration of the Defenders of the vulgar scholastick Notion; because it clears the Scheme I am speaking of, [even tho' it should be supposed to look upon the Divine Persons as being truly infinite or immense in their Natures, from any Absurdity or Contradiction; but at the same Time, it involves their Notion, of three infinite or immense Persons which they suppose to be Individually of the same Nature, in the utmost Confusion and Impossibility.

agrees with me. When Dr Clarke saith, *all Divine Powers, except absolute Supremacy and Independency, are communicated to the Son*; He evidently means, all Divine Powers relating to his Character; all such Powers as the Scripture speaks of, and can be and are communicated. But I hope the learned Querist is so good a Philosopher as to perceive, (tho' He doth not consider it,) that *Absolute infinite Perfections* include and infer *Supremacy and Independency*. Therefore, when Dr Clarke excepted *Supremacy and Independency*, He plainly in Reason and Consequence excepted *absolute infinite Powers*. So that the Objector might well have spar'd asking in the 6th Querie, whether *infinite Perfection* can be communicated to a *finite Being*; an evident Contradiction, and which ought not to have been put by one Scholar upon another. Whether every Being, besides the supreme Being, must not necessarily be a Creature; shall be answer'd to, presently. In the mean While, Dr Clarke acknowledgeth, and I agree with Him, that the *bighest Things*, are spoken of the Son in Scripture; But sure 'tis reasonable to understand those *bighest Things*, according to the plain Revelation, without carrying them further than the Scripture doth: And how can we know the Extent of them better, than by those Offices to which they are revealed the consequent Powers? But the learned Querist will not affirm, that either the Scripture speaks of, or the Nature of the Offices of the Son of God requires, *absolutely infinite Perfections*. The Texts by which those Powers are to be determined, are those (rightly offered by the learned Querist,) which attribute the Creation of the World to God the Father, and also to the Son of God; clearly reconciled, by comparing

ring them with *Ephes. 3, 9, God who created all Things by Jesus Christ: and Heb. 1, 2. by whom also He made the World.* The Son of God, is manifestly the Father's *Agent* in the Creation of the Universe; consequently, is *subordinate* in Nature and Powers to Him. Then as to the Extent of those Powers exercised by the Son, in Subordination to the Will of the Father, in the Work of Creation; Was the Extent of the Powers then exercised infinite, 'tis evident the World must be infinite also; which is too great an Absurdity to be affirmed by any reasonable Person.

Q U E R I E S

Built upon the Texts relating to the Creation.

Qu. 1st.

WHETHER the Creator of all Things was not Himself uncreated, and therefore could not be *ἐξ ἑκ οὐ τινος* made out of Nothing?

Qu. 2d.

Whether there can be any Middle, between being made out of Nothing, and out of Something; that is, between out of nothing, and out of the Father's Substance; between being essentially God, and being a Creature?

Qu. 3d.

Whether consequently the Son must not be either essentially God, or else a meer Creature?

Whether

Whether Dr Clarke, who every where denies Qu. 4th. the Consubstantiality of the Son, as absurd and contradictory; does not by Consequence affirm the Son to be a Creature $\epsilon\kappa\ \sigma\upsilon\tau\eta\varsigma$, and so fall under his own Censure, and is self-condemn'd?

Whether He also must not of Consequence affirm Qu. 5th. of the Son, that there was a Time when He was not, since God must exist before the Creature; and therefore is again self-condemn'd? And whether He does not equivocate shamefully in saying elsewhere, that the second Person has been always with the First, and that there has been no Time when He was not so? And lastly, whether it be not a vain and weak Attempt, to pretend to trim between the Orthodox and the Arians, or to carry the Son's Divinity in the least higher than the Arians did, without taking in the Consobstantiality?

These five Queries (which are also the ^{Ans. to} strength of what Dr Wells has alledged in his ^{1st, 2d,} last Book;) and others of the like Kind, are ^{3d, 4th,} all, at most, but Arguments *ad Ignorantiam*, ^{and 5th.} or *Verecundiam*; to put us upon determining Things, on either Side, not clearly revealed, which some are ready to catch at, in Order for a Pretence of Censure.) However, I will answer, as far as I think it reasonable to be requir'd of me. Premising This only, that the Question might in the very same manner be put Thus, (for Example:) Can there be any Middle, between *begotten* and *unbegotten*? Undoubtedly there cannot: Nevertheless, every one plainly sees how unreasonable a Consequence it would be to infer, that every Thing which can by no means be said to be *begotten*, is therefore *unbegotten*, in the same Sense

Sense as God is *unbegotten*. This being premised; I answer, *First*: That the *Creator* of all Things must be himself *uncreated*, is an unavoidable Consequence in Reason. If therefore the *Scripture-Sense*, be the true and only proper Sense of the word *Creature*; to wit, the visible and invisible Worlds, brought into Being by the Power of the $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ or Son of God, in Subordination to the Will and Power of the Father; then 'tis manifest, that the $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ who thus created them, must (whatever is the Nature of his own *Production* or *Generation*,) be in this Way of speaking, *uncreated*: And it is (I think) for this Reason, that the Scriptures never say that He is *created*; tho' it must be confess'd, on the other Hand, that they never say that He is *uncreated*. If the learned Querist hath any Thing to object against This Notion of *Creature*, reveal'd in the Scripture, I will consider it: If He hath not, then it must be confess'd that Dr Clarke hath Reason (notwithstanding any *Philosophy* and *vain Deceit* of the *School-Metaphysicks*,) to trim (if I may here use the Language of the learned Objector) betwixt the *Orthodox* and the *Arians*. I will only (with Submission) give the learned Objector one *Caution*, viz. not to say, or attempt to prove, that every Being that is *deriv'd*, must be for That Reason a *Creature*; For so even his own Notion, (since he cannot deny but the Son is *generated*, i. e. *deriv'd*,) will favour the *Arians*. As to what follows in the *Queries*; that either the Son of God must be the *individual Substance* of the Father, or else ὅτι ἐκ οὐρανοῦ with the *Arians*: I answer; if both *Scripture* and *Reason* clearly demonstrate, that the Son is *not the individual Substance* of the Father; who must look to that Consequence, if it was One? For my Part, I am

I am convinced that the Son is *not the individual Substance* of the Father; and, if it was a true *Disjunction*, that he must either be *such*, or else *ἕκκιν ὁρτων*, it would indeed follow that the *Arian* Doctrine was true. But I see no Necessity to acknowledge the Certainty of the *Disjunction*. The *Nicene* Fathers thought the Son to be, neither the *ἰοία τῷ πατρί*, the Substance of the Father, nor *ἕκκιν ὁρτων*; but *Ἐκ τῆς ἰοίας τῷ πατρί*, from the Substance of the Father. Indeed, in general, I dare not positively determine that God produced all Things or any Thing (strictly and metaphysically speaking,) out of Nothing. How God brings Beings into real Existence, we know not; because we know not their Essences: Or whether it be a Contradiction to predicate Existence of them, before there coming into *that State* which they now are in, and which we call their *Creation*; we know not. So that here again (I think) *Dr Clarke* justly trims betwixt the *scholastick Orthodox* and the *Arians*. Lastly; that God could eternally act, that is, could in any Point of Duration of his own Existence exercise his eternal Power and Will in producing Beings, cannot be denied; and therefore Beings distinct from the one supreme God, may be said to be *eternal*, as far as we are able to reason about Eternity; (I mean, as it is a *Negative Idea*;) so that we cannot conceive Time when they were not. Hence also (I think) *Dr Clarke* may trim betwixt the *Arians* and the *scholastick Orthodox*. But to say that God *did* or *could* eternally generate or produce his own Individual Substance, is the greatest Absurdity and Contradiction in the World; and therefore, I trust, when seriously and calmly thought on, will be rejected by the learned and impartial *Que-rist*.

rift. For if there be a Communication, Pro-
 duction, Generation, or whatever else we
 call it, of Substance or Being, from the one
 supreme Cause; it must necessarily be some
 thing *individually distinct* from that one supreme
 Cause; otherwise it must communicate or ge-
 nerate *it self*, which is in Reality no Commu-
 nication or Generation at all. Hence it evi-
 dently follows, that if there *can* be an *eternal*
Generation, it must be in the Sense of Dr Clarke
 to wit, of a *distinct subordinate Being*: Other-
 wise the Defenders of the vulgar scholastick
 Notion, only amuse us with *Jargon*, when
 they tell us of *eternal Generation*; and must
 mean, after all, one eternal Being or Person
 subsisting under three distinct Names, Modes
 or Attributes; which is deep *Sabellianism*, as
 a late Author hath clearly prov'd against Mr
 Nye. Therefore it was not candidly ask'd
whether Dr Clarke doth not equivocate shamefully
in saying that the second Divine Person Always
existed with the First, at the same Time making
 Him a *distinct individual Being*? The Doctor
 spoke as became a modest and a reasonable
 Man; And when the Defenders of the vulgar
 scholastick Notion, use the same Language in
 another Sense, they are confus'd and unintelli-
 gible, neither consistent with Scripture, nor
 Reason, nor with themselves. Truly I think
 it full as proper and sincere a Way of speaking
 even with Respect to *eternal Existence*; to say
 that the Son was begotten *eternally* by the
 eternal Power and Will of the Father, a *distinct*
individual Being; as to say, that there was an
eternal necessary Generation or Communication
 of the *one individual Substance* of the Father
 and to the Son. This latter Way of speaking
 (with Submission) no more proves the Son to

be (in the strict *Metaphysical* Sense) *absolutely eter-*
nal, than the other; but is (as I have proved)
ininitely more absurd. Can the *same Nature*
be both *Unbegotten* in the Father, and *generated*
or communicated in the Son, at the *same In-*
stant, or *without beginning to be generated* or
communicated? Does not the Act of Genera-
tion imply a *Beginning* of something to be *what*
it was not before; let the Cause be *what it will*;
or the Substance generated, *what it will*? Is there
not therefore exactly the same Ground to in-
fer from the vulgar Scholastick Notion, that the
Son had a *Beginning*, and that there was Dura-
tion before he was; as there is to infer any such
Thing from Dr Clarke's Notion? And so, do not
the Defenders of the vulgar Explication, who
hold *eternal Generation*, tho' of the Substance of
the one God; as much fall under the Censure
of affirming *that there was a Time when the Son of*
God was not, as Dr Clarke doth? And do they
not as much equivocate, and are as much self-
condemned, as Dr Clarke is? Their saying for
themselves, that they hold the Son to be of *one*
individual Substance with the Father, which Sub-
stance is *without Beginning*; only shews, that
they shamefully contradict Themselves by
affirming at the same time that He is *begotten*
without a Beginning; but mends not the Matter
at all in the *Argument*. For, be That as it
will; if the Generation or Communication of
the one Divine Substance, be the Production
of the Son, (as is confess'd by the Defenders
of the vulgar Scholastick Nation;) then,
tho' the Divine Substance be (as Self-exist-
ent) *without Beginning*, in which Sense it is
the Person of the Father; yet as generated in
the Production of the Son, it must *have a Be-*
ginning :

ginning: And consequently, tho' there never was a Time when the Father or Self-existent Substance was not; yet, in these Mens Way of arguing, there must have been a Time when the Son or Generated Divine Substance was not. It can never be truly said, but that God could as much eternally produce Beings distinct from Himself, by an Act of his Will; as generate them by an eternal necessary Communication of his own individual Substance. So that the Defenders of the vulgar scholastick Notion in condemning Dr Clarke, are evidently Self-condemned; and infinitely absurd into the Bargain.

Of the Generation of the Son of God.

I O H. 1, 14. — We beheld his Glory, the Glory as of the Only-begotten of the Father.

—18.—The only-begotten Son, which is in the Bosom of the Father.

5, 17, — My Father worketh hitherto, and I work.

—18.—Said that God was his Father [*not leg. id est* his own or proper Father,] making himself equal with God.

3, 16. For God so loved the World, that he gave his only-begotten Son.

Colof. 1, 15.—The first-born of every Creature.

Heb. 1, 2. Hath in these last Days spoken unto us by his Son, whom He hath appointed Heir of all Things.

—5. For unto which of the Angels said He at any Time Thou art my Son, this Day have I begotten Thee? And again, I will be to Him a Father, and he shall be to Me Son.

—6. And again, when He bringeth in the First-begotten into the World, He saith, and let all the Angels of God worship him.

—8. But unto the Son He saith, Thy Throne, O God.

1 Joh. 4, 9. In this was manifested the Love of God towards us, because that God sent his only-begotten Son into the World.

CON

CONSIDERATIONS

on the preceding Texts.

THE fore-going Texts, and the following Queries drawn from them, contain the full Strength of all the Arguments offer'd by the Defenders of the vulgar scholastick Notion, to prove that the Individual Consubstantiality of the Son of God with the Father, is infer'd from his Generation. And indeed the extraordinary and ineffable Generation, by which He is above all Others most properly and emphatically the Son of God, was most strongly urg'd by the Ancients * for the Proof of his real Subsistence and Divinity. And I really think that

* The Council of Antioch, in their Epistle to Paulus, Samosatenus, say of the Son of God ; ὡς γε γινώσκουσιν, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐστὶ καὶ ὑπερτάτος Θεὸν, Θεὸν ὕιόν ; " that He is God, not by being merely Fore known, but by his Substance and real Personal Subsistence, as being the Son of God." And Nqvatian : Ut enim præscripsit ipsa Natura hominem credendum, qui ex homine sit ; ita eadem Natura præscripsit & Deum credendum esse, qui ex Deo sit ; " as by the Law of Nature He is to be esteem'd a Man, who is of Man ; so by the same Law of Nature, He is to be esteem'd a God, who is of God : " De Trinit. cap. 11. Again. Quomodo enim, ego & Pater unum sumus, si non & est Deus & Filius ? qui idcirco unum potest dici, dum ex ipso est, & dum filius ejus est, & dum ex ipso nascitur, dum ex ipso processisse reperitur, per quod & Deus est : " How can That saying be true, I and my Father are one, if he is not both God and Son ? " Who therefore may be said to be one [with the Father,] because " He is from Him, is His Son, is born of Him, came forth from Him, " on which Account He is God also : " cap. 23. And Eusebius : καὶ λόγος γὰρ τῆς ὁμοειπειας ἀνείη τῷ καὶ αὐτὸν εἶναι θεόν, τὸ μόνον εἶναι φύσει τῷ Θεῷ υἱόν καὶ μονογενῆ χρηματίζειν, " And all this may be the Reason why He [Christ] also is God, because he only is the Son of God " by Nature, and call'd only begotten. " Demonst. Evang. pag. 227.

the Scriptures do not afford any stronger Argument or Reason, whereby he can be proved to be God, than That is. But yet whoever considers the full Import of *Jesus* being the Son of God, as declared in the Scriptures, will find that the Arguments drawn from thence, to prove his individual Consubstantiality with God the Father, are altogether unconvulsive.

'Tis certain that the above-mentioned Scriptures, with many others, prove *Jesus Christ* to be the Son of God in a peculiar and more extraordinary Manner than any other Person ever was or can be: But it doth not appear, that those Scriptures, or any others wherein he is styled Son of God or Only-begotten &c; have any Relation to the Production of his Metaphysical Nature or Existence. Whatever is the Metaphysical Essence or Substance of the Son of God, or after whatever manner He came into Being, whether by Production, Generation, Speaking forth, Communication, Emanation, (about which, both Ancients and Moderns have puzzled and confounded and contradicted Themselves and one another;) it concerns not Us, nor is revealed to us. The true and [I think] only Meaning of the Scripture's so frequently calling *Jesus Christ* the Son of God, is, that He [the same Person to whom the Father originally gave to have Life in Himself, in what Manner soever That was; and who, in the Fulness of Time, was, by the Power of God, born of a Virgin; and after That, begotten again by the Resurrection from the Dead, *Acts* 13, 33;] is appointed by God to be the Heir of all Things, the Messias, King, Saviour and Judge of the World. *Christ* or *Messias*, and the Son of God, were always understood by the Jews to be synonymous Expressions. Nothing is

more

more clear than This, in Scripture. Mat. 16, 16, Simon Peter answered and said, thou art Christ the Son of the living God. Joh. 1, 49, Rabbi, thou art the Son of God, thou art the King of Israel. Joh. 11, 27, Lord, I believe that thou art the Christ the Son of God. Mat. 26, 63, I adjure thee by the living God to tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God. Luk. 22, 70, Art thou then the Son of God? Which is evidently the same with that which they asked, verse 67, Art thou the Christ? Compare Mark 14, 61, Art thou the Christ the Son of the Blessed? Acts 9, 20, And straightway he preached Christ in the Synagogues, that he is the Son of God. Joh. 20, 31; But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God. Hence it appears, that Christ or Messias is Synonymous to the Term, Son of God, throughout the Scriptures; And upon whatever Other particular Accounts he is stil'd the Son of God, they all plainly relate still to the Office of Messias. Luk. 1, 35, — The holy Ghost shall come upon Thee, and the Power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore also that Holy Thing which shall be born of thee, shall be called the Son of God, that is the Messias; who was foretold that he should be born and become incarnate after this extraordinary Manner, Isai. 7, 14. He is said to be begotten of God, when he raised him from the Dead, Acts, 13, 33; God hath fulfilled the same, unto us their Children, in that he hath raised up Jesus again, as it is also written in the second Psalm, thou art my Son, this Day have I begotten Thee; compar'd with Rom. 1, 4, And declar'd to be the Son of God with Power, according to the Spirit of Holiness, by the Resurrection from the Dead. Col. 1, 18, who is the Beginning, the First-born from the Dead. Rev.

1, 5, *The First-begotten of the Dead*. Here again the *Son of God* is the *Messias*, proved to be so by his Resurrection from the Dead according to the Prophecies concerning him. And This Meaning of the Term *Son of God*, is no less evident in all the Texts alledged above at the Head of this Argument, being the explanatory Notes of the *Messias*. In vain therefore are the two Places, *Joh. 5, 18; 10, 33*; so frequently urged by the Defenders of the vulgar School-notion, to prove *Christ*, as the *Son of God*, to be Himself (*ὁ θεός*) God in the highest Sense, and Individually Consubstantial with the Father: it being plain [as Dr Clarke hath excellently proved in his *Answer to Mr Nelson's Friend*, Numb. 23, 25, 26,] that all our Lord meant by stiling Himself so emphatically the *Son of God*, or by saying that God was *His Father* (*ὁ πατήρ μου*) was to intimate and make the *Jews* understand that He was the promised *Messias*: Being not willing to declare it in exprefs Words, that they might have no Pretence thereby to take away his Life; but to shew it by the Miracles which He wrought, which were a sufficient Testimony that He was the Son of God, *sanctify'd and sent into the World*, *Joh. 10, 36*; whom God had anointed with the Holy Ghost and with Power, *Acts 10, 38*; that is, that He was the *Messias*. The *Jews* perceiving his Meaning, but not believing him, nor yet knowing how to lay an Accusation against him from his Words, maliciously insinuated that He made Himself God, *Joh. 10, 33*; and equal with God, *Joh. 5, 18*. Our Saviour, in Answer, removes the Charge of assuming Equality with God; by telling them, that tho' he was the *Son of God*, yet that the Son can do nothing of Himself, but

what
Father
hat hi
commit
That
of the
he W
him th
To the
Joh. 1
God H
the Fa
by his
you fro
Father
stances
prov'd
the Son
the Pow
So is th
filed t
the A
prove
by the
Notion
be beg
ration.
He wa
Things
was pr
most e
gives o
the Fir
the H
and ag
As, an
minion
accordi
to Jesh
wha

what he seeth the Father do, ver. 19: That the Father loveth the Son, and sheweth him all Things that himself doth, ver. 20: That the Father hath committed all Judgment to the Son, ver. 22; That he seeketh not his own Will, but the Will of the Father which sent him, ver. 30: That the Works which He doth, bear Witness of him that the Father hath sent him, ver. 36. To the Other Accusation, of making himself God, Job. 10, 23; he replies, not that he was (*ὁ θεός*) God Himself; but that he was really sent by the Father, spake in his Name, and worked by his Power: Many good Works have I shewed you from my Father, ver. 32. — sent (by the Father) into the World, ver. 36. In Both Instances he confuted their Calumnies, and prov'd that he was what he pretended to be, the Son of God or the *Messias*, invested with the Power and Authority of God. In vain also is that Text, Col. 1, 15, (wherein Christ is styled the *First-born of every Creature*;) urg'd by the *Arians* and *Socinians* on one Hand, to prove the Son of God to be a Creature; and by the Defenders of the Vulgar Scholastick Notion on the other Hand, to prove him to be begotten of God by a necessarily eternal Generation. For though it is evidently true, that He was with God before the Creation of Things, in what manner soever He himself was produced; yet the Sense which the late most excellent *Primate, Arch-bishop Tillotson*, gives of this Place, (*viz.* that Christ is called the *First-born of every Creature*, chiefly as being the *Heir or Lord of all Things*;) is most clear and agreeable to the Analogy of Scripture, As, amongst the *Jews*, Principality and Dominion went along with the *Primogeniture*, according to the Words, the Kingdom gave He to *Jehoram*, because he was the *First-born*, 2 Chron.

21, 3; so the Title *First-born* came in common Use to signify That *Dominion*: Wherefore God saith of *David*, Psal. 89, 28, *I will make Him my First-born*, i. e. the *Ruler of my People*; as the Words preceeding and following plainly show. In ver. 26, God saith, *I will set his Dominion also in the Sea, and his right Hand in the Floods*; and therefore v. 27, *he shall call me Thou art my Father*: And it follows in the latter Part of v. 28, that He [*David*] shall be made *higher than the Kings of the Earth*; and v. 30, that *his Throne (shall be) as the Days of Heaven*. Here *David*, being the most eminent Type of the *Messias*, is invested with That Title of Honour which is peculiar to Him who was to be the *Prince of the Kings of the Earth*, Rev. 1, 5; and to have a Name written, *King of Kings, and Lord of Lords*, Rev. 19, 16. Secondly, this Sense of the Words is yet more evident, because the Passage is exactly parallel to what the same *Apostle* saith, Heb. 1, 2, that the Son of God is appointed *Heir of all Things*. The Word *Heir*, hath not only the full Import of *First-born*, being the immediate Consequent of it; but expresseth also the Dignity and Rule which always followed the Inheritance or Primogeniture; And therefore in the Sense, not only of the the *Jews*, but of the *Heathens* and the ancient *Christians* also to be *Heir* was the same as to be † *Lord*. The *Psalmist*, prophesying of *Christ*, saith, Psal. 2, 7, *Thou art my Son, this Day have I begotten Thee*; fore-telling in these Words, that the *Messias*

† *Justinian* saith; *pro Hærede se gerere, est pro Domino gerere veteres enim Hæredes pro Dominis appellabant*; "To act as an Heir" is to act as Lord; for the Ancients used the Word *Heir* for "Lord:" *Justinian Institut. Lib. 2. Tit. 19. §. 6.* See Dr *Whitby's* Comment. on Col. 1. 15.

Messias was to be the *First-begotten* of God, the *First-born from the Dead*, Col. 1, 18, the *Heir* or *Lord* of all Things: For in Verse the sixth, he calls him *King*; *Yet have I set* [or more truly, *anointed*] *my King upon my holy Hill of Sion*: And in v. 8, he saith, that God would give him the *Heathen* for his *Inheritance*, and the utmost Parts of the *Earth* for his *Possession*; that is, that all Nations should be made subject to his *Dominion*. For, to be *Heir*, or to inherit, in the *Jewish* Phrase, is (as I observ'd) to be *Lord* or to rule. Thus *Psal.* 82; 8; *Arise, O God, and judge thou the Earth, for thou shalt take all the Heathen* [or all Nations] *to thine Inheritance*, i. e. Thou shalt have the *Sovereignty* and *Government* of them. *Jer.* 49; 1, 2, *Hath Israel no Sons? hath he no Heir, [i. e. Ruler?] Why then doth their King* [the King of the *Ammonites*] *inherit, i. e. rule in Gad?* — *Then shall Israel be Heir, i. e. Ruler, unto them that were his Heirs, i. e. his Rulers, saith the Lord.* And that the *Dominion* and *Preeminence* of Christ over all Creatures, is signify'd by this Phrase; appears further, *Thirdly*, from all those other Places wherein he is stiled the *First-born*; which plainly relate, not to the *Production* or *Generation* of his Nature before all Worlds, but to his *Birth* to, or *Inheritance* of, the *mediatorial Kingdom* of the *Messias*; into the full Possession of which, he was invested at his *Resurrection* from the *Dead*, upon Account of his becoming *Man*, and redeeming us by his meritorious *Sufferings* for us. In Col. 1, 18, He is call'd the *First-born from the Dead*; and the Import or Reason follows, *that in all Things* [over the *Dead* as well as the *Living*] *he might have the Prebeminence*; or, as the same *Apocstle* more fully expresseth it, *Rom.* 14, 9,

That he might be Lord both of the Dead and Living. And when St John had called him, *Rev. 1, 5,* the *First-begotten* (or *First-born*) of the *Dead*; he immediately adds, *and the Prince of the Kings of the Earth.* Lastly; St Paul introduceth God speaking by his Prophet, *Heb. 1, 6,* And again, *when He bringeth in the First-begotten* [or *First-born*] *into the World, He saith, And let all the Angels of God worship Him:* This being the Explication of the fourth and fifth Verses preceding, (wherein the Son of God is said to be made so much better than the Angels, as he hath by Inheritance obtain'd a more excellent Name than they; For unto which of the Angels said He at any Time, *Thou art my Son, this Day have I begotten Thee*?) it must be spoken of the Messias invested with universal Power and Dominion after his Resurrection from the Dead; the Words of the 5th Verse, *Thou art my Son, this Day have I begotten Thee,* [which have the Import of *First-born*, and are a Prophecy of the Kingdom of the Messias, as I before observ'd,] being twice apply'd to his Resurrection by the same Apostle, *Acts 13, 33,* and *Heb. 5, 5.* Therefore the sixth Verse should be render'd [as Dr *Whitby* observes, and as is more agreeable to the Greek, *ὅταν δὲ πάλιν ἐσταίῃ*] And when he bringeth again the *First-begotten* (from the Dead, *Col. 1, 18; Rev. 1, 5,*) into the World, He saith, *And let all the Angels of God worship Him.* So that the Title of *First-born* of every Creature, *Col. 1, 15;* the being said to be appointed Heir of all Things, *Heb. 1, 2;* to have by Inheritance obtain'd a more excellent Name than the Angels, who are made subject to his Dominion, *v. 4, 5, 6;* to sit down on the right Hand of the Majesty on high; to have a Throne and Kingdom, and be stil'd God, *v. 3, 8;* are

All

All e
or Th
phesi
fions
with
cient
broug
given
that
serve
nion
that
iab to
unto
be up
called
a mi
truly
the P
the I
were
on fi
him
Ther
and
that
[all
nion
and T
shoul
Glor
The
Hea
Powe
Nam
but
Thin
Hea

All evident Tokens of *Jesus* being the *Messias*, or *That Son of Man*, of whom *Daniel* had prophesied *ch. 7; 13, 14*, I saw in the *Night Visions*, and behold one like the *Son of Man* came with the *Clouds of Heaven*, and came to the *Ancient of Days* [to *God the Father*,] and they brought him near before Him; and there was given Him *Dominion and Glory and a Kingdom*, that all *People, Nations and Languages* should serve him; his *Dominion* is an everlasting *Dominion* which shall not pass away, and his *Kingdom* that which shall not be destroyed: and whom *Isaiah* foretold, *ch. 9, 6*; Unto us a *Child* is born, unto us a *Son* is given, and the *Government* shall be upon his *Shoulders*; And his *Name* shall be called *Wonderfull, Counsellor, the mighty God* [or, a mighty God,] the everlasting *Father* [or, more truly, according to the *Heb.* and *LXXII*, the *Father of the Age to come*, viz. the *Age of the Messias*,] the *Prince of Peace*. All which, were fulfilled in our Lord after his *Resurrection* from the *Dead*. Then, all *Power* was given him both in *Heaven and Earth*, *Mat. 28, 18*; Then, *God* [the *Father*] highly exalted him, and gave him a *Name* which is above every *Name*, that at the *Name* of *Jesus* every *Knee* should bow, [all *Things* should be subject to his *Dominion*,] of *Things in Heaven*, and *Things in Earth*, and *Things under the Earth*, and that every *Tongue* should confess that *Jesus Christ* is *Lord*, to the *Glory of God the Father*, *Phil. 2; 9, 10, 11*. Then, *God* set him at his own right *Hand* in the *Heavenly Places*, far above all *Principality and Power*, and *Might and Dominion*, and every *Name* that is nam'd, not only in this *World*, but in that which is to come; and hath put all *Things* under his *Feet*, and gave Him to be the *Head* over all *Things* to the *Church*, *Eph. 1*;

20, 21, 22. Then, He went into Heaven, and is on the right Hand of God; Angels, and Authorities, and Powers, being made subject unto Him, 1 Pet. 3, 22. It was neither upon Account of the Excellence of his *metaphysical Nature*, nor the *Act of Creation* itself, that Angels and even all created Beings were thus made subject unto Him; but this Dominion was the Royalty of his Kingdom as *Messias*, to which he received the solemn Inauguration at his Resurrection from the Dead: Then it was, that God the Father put him in the full Possession of all Things which were created by Him and for Him, Col. 1, 16. Thus (I think) it is proved that the Titles of *Son of God*, *First-born* &c, so frequently ascrib'd in Scripture to our Lord *Jesus Christ*, do not relate to the Production of his *metaphysical Nature* (how *divine* soever,) but to his Investiture in the Office of *Messias* or *Heir of all Things*, under various Notes or Characters. Whatever Relation He may bear to God with regard to the incomprehensible Dignity of his *metaphysical Nature*, whether as *Son*, or perhaps some other to us altogether unknown Name; (which may possibly be the Meaning of *St John*, when He saith, *Rev. 19, 12*, that *He had a Name written, that no one knew but He Himself* :) It was his *Mission* from God the Father into the World, his being born of a Virgin, his being anointed, or sanctified by the Holy Ghost, and invested with divine Authority for the Office of *Messias*; and the Power and Dominion which God gave Him as *Heir of all Things*, for the full Accomplishment of This high Office, when he begat him again (*Acts 13, 33*,) by the Resurrection from the Dead and Ascension into Heaven; These, I say, were the Things, by which He became, in the Scripture-sense, the Son

Son
er
Ang
and
the
Chri
hav
He
Gho
of w
and
nati
Ang
Dom
righ
Cha
of i
Pers
[as
we m
tho
Perf
[and
He
dom
"fu

† I
Savior
as He
of his
also p
Invoca
is (as
acts a
and e
Himse
[the c
self, b
rify A

Son of God with Power, Rom. 1, 4, in a higher Manner than any other Person. And tho' Angels and Men are called the Sons of God, and Gods, upon Account of their Offices and the Exercise of divine Authority; yet is Jesus Christ alone the Only-begotten of the Father, as having a far more excellent Office, to which He was endow'd with the Power of the Holy Ghost above Measure; and for the Execution of which, He is invested with universal Power and Dominion, and so is become (in Subordination to the Father,) over all (both Men and Angels) God blessed for ever. This Power and Dominion, to which Christ is advanc'd at the right Hand of God, is not only the highest Character and Prerogative of his Sonship spoken of in Scripture; but is the Foundation of his Personal Godhead and Adoration. And hence [as Dr Clarke hath most admirably observ'd] we may learn the Reason, why the Holy Ghost, tho' a divine Person, of ineffable Dignity and Perfection; is yet never called God or Lord [and I will add † Son] in Scripture; because He is never represented as the Heir of a Kingdom, "sitting on a Throne, and exercising supreme Dominion, but always as executing

"ting

† I add, Son; because I have proved That Title, as applyed to our Saviour, to be synonymous to *Messias*, and to have the same Import as Heir of all Things, or Lord; expressing, not so much the Production of his Nature, as the Dominion of his Person. And for this Reason also probably it is, that the Holy Ghost is never worshipped with direct Invocation in Scripture; because He hath no Personal Dominion, which is (as I observ'd) the Foundation of direct Adoration; but He always acts as the Messenger and Representative of the Son, executing his Will and exercising his Power; according to the Words of our Saviour Himself, *Joh. 16; 7, 13, 14*, — But if I depart, I will send Him [the Comforter, or Holy Ghost] unto you. — He shall not speak of Himself, but whatsoever He shall hear, that shall he speak. — He shall glorify Me, for he shall receive of Mine.

“ting the Will of the Father and of the Son,
 “in the Administration of the Government of
 “the Church of God:” See *Scrip. Doct.* pag.
 296, 297. What Foundation there is in
 Scripture for our Belief of the *Existence of the*
Son of God before all Worlds, cannot (I think)
 be shown from the Passages speaking of his
Generation, or of his being the *First-born*, and
only-begotten Son of God; these being clearly
 ascribed to him on *other Accounts*. But yet
 it may undoubtedly be proved from many
other Places; see *Job.* 1; 1, 3, 10, 17;
 5, 24. *1 Cor.* 8, 6. *Ephes.* 3, 9. *Col.* 1;
 16, 17. *Heb.* 1; 2, 10. So that on *This Ac-*
count also, (tho’ the Scriptures are silent in the
 Matter, as not relating to *us*;) we may well
 and reasonably stile *Jesus Christ the only-begot-*
ten Son or Word; there being no better or pro-
 perer Phrase whereby we can express the incom-
 prehensible *Production of his Nature or Substance*
before all Worlds by the immediate Power and
 Will of God the Father Himself, and also his
 ineffable Relation and intimate Union with
 God the Father. But from what hath been
 said I conclude, that the Arguments drawn
 from Scripture to prove *such a proper and es-*
sential Generation of the Son of God from
Eternity, as makes Him *one Individual Sub-*
stance with God the Father, must needs be
 groundless and unconvulsive; because it does
 not appear that the Scriptures, tho’ they ful-
 ly assert his *Existence before all Things or Beings*,
 apply *Generation* either to the *Term or Nature*
 of his *Existence*: And if they did, (which we
 may well allow without direct Proof,) yet it
 would be impossible to conclude by Reason,
 that such a Generation was the Production of
 the

he
and

W
tione
Firs
God
and
of a
Chr
of G
W
ral o
and t
God
per A
parta
same
fore i
of G
indiv
is unc
God
est an
ther
tion ?

Th
gotten
Christ
physica
or to
the S
Office
being
nation
Fathe

the individual Substance of God the Father, in and to the Son.

Whether, according to the Texts above-men-Qu. 1st. tioned, the Titles of Son of God, Only-begotten, First-begotten or First-born, and the Relation to God as his own or proper Father [μὴ ἰσθῆμι ;] and being styled, on Account of this Sonship, Heir of all Things, and God ; do not prove Jesus Christ to be the proper, natural, or essential Son of God ?

Whether Jesus Christ can be the proper, natu-Qu. 2d. ral or essential Son of God, without being of one and the same metaphysical Substance or Essence with God his Father ; since we have no strict and proper Meaning of a Son, other than of that which partakes of the Parents Substance, and so is of the same Nature, and equal to it ? Whether therefore it doth not hence follow, that, unless the Son of God be metaphysically consubstantial, or of one individual Substance, [since the divine Substance is uncompounded and absolutely indivisible,] with God the Father ; he cannot be his Son in the highest and proper Sense of Sonship ; but only, like other inferior Beings, a Son by Grace and Adoption ?

The Titles of Son of God, First-born, Only-be-^{Ans. to} gotten, do not appear to be spoken of Jesus^{1st.} Christ in Scripture, with Relation to his metaphysical Nature, (whatever that in reality is,) or to an Essential Generation of his Being from the Substance of God ; but with relation to his Office of Messias, his Mission into the World, and being (upon account of his Humiliation, Incarnation and Sufferings,) appointed by God the Father, (who gave unto him to have Life in himself,

himself, and said unto him, *Thou art my Son,* the *Heir* and *Lord* of all Things, our *Saviour*, our *Judge*, and our *God*. An *Essential* or *metaphysically* *Consubstantial* Generation, such as the Objector speaks of, is, with Respect to God, an unwarranted Expression; no where reveal'd in Scripture; and approaches nearer to the Notions of the Old Philosophers, than to the Language of the Gospel; it having been the Opinion of many of the Philosophers, that their *Inferiour Deities*, and even the *Souls of Men*, were metaphysically *Consubstantial* with (tho' not *Equal* to) the supreme God. Nevertheless, *Jesus Christ* is the *True Son* of God; and might well have called God [as the *Jews* maliciously said He did, *Joh. 5, 18,*] *malice id est, his own* or *proper Father*, upon Account of his Supreme *Dignity* and *Dominion* over all who are ever called *Sons of God*. But, in Answer to the second *Querie*;

Ans. to
2d.

Supposing *Jesus Christ* to be in the same *Son* the *Son of God* by Nature, and in the same *Manner* *consubstantially* generated, as *Man* is by Nature the *Son of Man*; yet the *Querist* would gain nothing by it, but the Absurdity of dividing the simple and uncompounded *Divine Substance* making a *Species* of God, and introducing *Polytheism*. To avoid this; tho' they are willing to take the Advantage of *humane* Generation in order to prove that the *Son of God*, being begotten of the Substance of the *Father*, is *absolutely equal* in Nature to the *Father*, as an *humane* *Son* and *Parent* always are; yet they are forc'd to leave this Comparison of *humane* Generation, in *That* Point, in which it can only be urged to any Purpose, viz. that the Generation is by *Division* or *Separation* of Parts.

And

And they affirm that he is begotten the whole Individual Substance of the supreme God the Father; not considering, that by this Argument they quite overthrow what they designed to prove, and wholly destroy the Generation and Sonship. For it is nothing but Division of Substance in the Parent, and a separate Existence of the Offspring in the same *specifick* Nature, that is the Foundation of the natural Relation of Father and Son in Mankind. Take away That Consideration, and the proper and natural Notion of Paternity and Filiation ceaseth amongst Men. If therefore the Son of God be the individual Substance of God, He is as much Father as Son, and the Father as much Son as Father; or truly, all Distinction of Person and Relation, is destroy'd. One learned Writer, who urges the Argument we are now upon, was so aware and sensible of the strength of this Reasoning, that He † forc'd himself to acknowledge so great an Absurdity and Contradiction, as to declare it to be "undoubtedly true that the one God is Father, and also true that the same God is Son [of the same Father;] the Father and Son being (saith He) comprehended in the same [individual] Godhead." But the Defenders of this scholastick Notion must declare, either that the one simple uncompounded Divine Substance is capable of Division; which is manifestly absurd; or else acknowledge that their Pretence of proving *metaphysical* Consubstantiality in the Filiation of the Son of God from the Instance of humane Generation, is trifling and impertinent; or lastly, if they will not disclaim individual Consubstantiality, must frankly tell us that the Son of God is not really a Son or relative Person, but a meer Name or empty Notion.

† See
Considerations on
Mr W—s
Historical
Preface,
pag. 87.

Notion. Whatever is the Meaning of the figurative Word *Generation*, allowing it to be applied to the *metaphysical Existence* of the Son of God; I see no Reason why *Jesus Christ* may not, even in this Respect, be *truly and properly* stiled the *Son of God*; not by being the same *individual Substance* with God the Father, [which, as we have seen, would be so far from giving Him the Highest and strictest Title to Sonship, that it quite takes away all manner of Relation, and introduces a total Confusion of Persons;] but by the *Production* of his *Nature and Being* immediately and ineffably from God Himself. This, if we rightly consider, is a nearer and properer Relation of Sonship, than That betwixt an humane Parent and his Offspring. For in *humane Generation*, a Son does not truly *derive* his *Nature or Being* (as the *Quakers* supposeth) from his Father, by a Communication of his Substance; But a Father is *merely an Instrument* in the Hands of God, in laying the Foundation for his Son's Subsistence. 'Tis by the mighty Power of *God alone*, by which a Child is brought into Life and Form. And therefore the Child is more properly the Son of God, (i. e. derived from Him, in his Nature,) than he is the Son of Man. Since therefore the Derivation of a Son from his Father, *merely as an instrumental Cause*, is the true and whole Foundation of Paternity and Filiation in *Mankind*; how much *more properly and truly* may *Christ* be called the *Son of God*, than any one can be the Son of Man, by the ineffable Derivation of his whole Being and Subsistence immediately by the incomprehensible Power and Will of the one supreme God, the alone proper Author of all Being? Whether we consider *Christ*, as being the Son of God by

the i
fical
one
ing
that
Dom
Him
He ca
mere
Sons
throu
Perfor
in H
ceive
12, A
Power
that b
all th
ch. 4
Faith
into y
1, 5
Childr
fore,
Sons
of the
adopt
a Son
He is
the So
order
option
Worsh
ver th
Creat
Wh
is not
ing et

the immediate Production of his metaphysical Nature by the Power and Will of the one supreme God the Father; or, according to the Scripture-Sense of the Phrase, that he is the Son of God by the Power and Dominion over all Things, which God gave Him as the Messias and Heir of all Things; He cannot, either Way, be said to be a Son by mere Grace or Adoption. We are the adopted Sons of God, by being in Covenant with Him through Christ; and by having our whole Persons sanctify'd and redeem'd, through Faith in Him, by the Spirit of Grace which we receive from God by Him; according to Job. 1, 12, *As many as received Him, to them gave He Power to become the Sons of God, even to them that believe in his Name*; Gal. 3, 26, *For ye are all the Children of God by Faith in Christ Jesus*; Rom. 8, 4, 6, *And because ye are Sons [of God by Faith,] God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your Hearts, crying, Abba, Father*. Ephes. 1, 5; *having predestinated us to the Adoption of Children by Jesus Christ unto Himself*. He therefore, through Faith in whom we are made the Sons of God by Grace, and who is the Giver of the Spirit by whose Sanctification we are the adopted Children of God; cannot Himself be a Son merely by This Adoption and Grace: But He is antecedently, and in a much higher Sense, the Son of God by Nature, as being originally (in order to bring Us to be the Sons of God by Adoption) invested in his own distinct Person with Worship and Adoration and invisible Dominion over the Church of God, and over the whole Creation.

Whether the individual Consubstantiality Qu. 3d.
is not also clearly prov'd by the Son's Generation being eternal, according to Prov. 8; 23, 25, I

G

[Wif-

[Wisdom] was set up from everlasting, — before the Hills was I brought forth; Mich. 4. 2, — Whose Goings forth have been from of Old, from everlasting. For if the Generation of the Son of God be simply and absolutely eternal, must it not be of the one individual Substance of God the Father, which only is simple and absolutely eternal?

Ans. to
3d.

The Son's Generation, (which, how it may be said to be *Eternal*, I have before shown,) is not prov'd to be *metaphysically Eternal* from Prov. 8: 23—25. The Passage most probably is not meant of Wisdom the Person; being not spoken of the מְסִיחָה or *Logos*, the Word; but of the חֵכְמָה or *σοφία*, Wisdom the Attribute of God. But allowing that the Son of God is here figuratively describ'd, because it is generally so suppos'd both by Ancients and Moderns; yet there is not in this Place any Mention of *metaphysically eternal* Generation. That which our Translators have render'd, from everlasting, means no more here than from or before the † Beginning of the Ages of the World (מְעוֹלָם and πρὸ τῆς αἰῶνος, Heb. and LXXII; and is accordingly explain'd in the Words immediately following; the whole Verse running thus, viz. *I was set up from everlasting [that is] from the Beginning, or ever the Earth was: When there were no Depths, I was brought forth, ver. 24; before the Mountains were set*

† Novatian, giving his Sense of the Eternity of the Son of God saith; *qui ante omne Tempus est, semper in Patre esse dicendus est*, "He who was before all Time, must needs be said to have been always in (or with) the Father;" *De Trinit. ch. 31*. The most ancient Writers, viz. of the first and second Century, express'd the Generation

bled, before the Hills was I brought forth. ver. 25. Nor, Secondly, is metaphysically eternal Generation prov'd from the Words of Mic. 5, 2, *Whose Goings forth have been from of Old, from everlasting*; that is, [according to the Original Hebrew to which the LXXII agree,] *from the Days, (or Beginning) of the Ages of the World.* The most natural signification of the whole Verse is, that the Prophet design'd to inform the *Jews*, that the Incarnation of the *Messias* there foretold, was not to be his first Appearance in the World; but that He had gone forth, or manifested himself as the *Angel of God's Presence* revealing his Will, from the Beginning of the World. So that by *Goings forth* is not meant his *Generation* or *Metaphysical Production*, but his *Manifestation* as being the *Messenger* and *Representative* of the supreme God, to declare his Will to Mankind; which could not be before the Creation of the World, and therefore the Prophet could not there speak of a *metaphysical, simple and absolute Eternity.*

Whether an Equality in Nature and Powers Qu. 4th. infer'd from the proper and essential Generation of
G 2 *the*

on of the Son of God to be *ἀχρόνως, αἰώνιος, καὶ πάντων αἰώνων*, without any Limitation of Time; but hardly ventured to say that it was *αἰδίως* absolutely and metaphysically *Eternal*: [The Passage, *ἀόγ & αἰδ &*, in the lesser Epistles of Ignatius, is with great Reason suspected to be spurious;] Nor wou'd the Orthodox after the Council of Nice, say that it was *ἀγενήτως*, or *ἀνάρχως*. And it is remarkable, that the 49th Apostolick Canon deposeth those who baptize *εἰς τρεῖς ἀνδρες*, into three Persons who are without Beginning. And Zonaras thus glosseth upon it; *ἕνα γὰρ ἀναρχόν ἡ ἐκκλησία σέβειν παρέλαβε, τὸν πατέρα, διὰ τὸ ἀνάκτον*; "The Tradition of the Church, is to worship one Person only, who is without Beginning, namely the Father as being absolutely without Cause."

*the Son of God, be not consistent with a Subordination of Persons; so that the Father may be Greater than the Son in This Respect, that He is a Self-originated and independent Subsistence, and the Fountain of Being to the Son, who will be always so much Less than the Father, as Dependency is than Independency, and That which is derived is less than that which is unoriginated? And * whether this Equality in Nature and Powers is not prov'd to be consistent with the Appellations of Greater or Less, by a very plain and familiar Instance taken from Scripture, Gen. 41; where we learn that Joseph, of the same Nature with Pharaoh King of Egypt, and in That Respect equal, was advanc'd by that Prince to the Administration of the Government, and invested with his whole Authority and Power, both in Relation to the Monarchy and the Royal Family; For says He, ver. 44, I am Pharaoh, and without Thee shall no Man lift up his Hand or Foot in all the Land of Egypt: and ver. 40, Thou shalt be over my House, and according to thy Word shall all my People be ruled: He in the mean Time reserving nothing to Himself but only the Superiority in the Throne, as being the independent Root of the monarchick Power which Joseph enjoyed by Derivation from him; For, adds He, ver. 40, only in the Throne will I be greater than Thou. Whether therefore, if Pharaoh was greater than Joseph, tho' they were Both equal in Nature and Powers; it can be hard to conceive that the Father should be greater than the Son, according to Joh. 14, 28, (tho' Both equal in Nature and Powers,) as being the Origin of the Son, and the Fountain of Powers derived to Him?*

* See Considerations on Mr W—s Historical Preface, pag. 51, 52, 53.

Would

Would the learned Objector argue, or could ^{Ans. 10} He prove, that God is a *Species*, or that the ^{4th} Son of God was begotten *specifically* Consubstantial with God the Father, as Man begets a Son of his own Kind by *Division of Substance* and Separation of Parts; the Argument deduc'd from the Instance of *Pharaoh* and *Joseph* would be apposite to his Purpose; and the Subordination of Person which He speaks of, (by the Son's Generation and the Father's Self-origination, the Son's Dependency and the Father's Independency,) would be more clear and consistent with such an Equality of *Nature*. But being he holds an *Indivisibility of Essence* in God the Father and the Son of God, so that they are [according to his Argument] *one Individual Godhead*; I wonder that a learned Author should not perceive, that such a Subordination of Person is utterly inconsistent with his Notion. For can the *same individual Being* be *dependent* and *independent*, *originated* and *unoriginated*, *begotten* and *unbegotten*? or can the *same Person* (which is the unavoidable Consequence of his Notion) be *subordinate to Himself*, *Greater* and *Less* than Himself, according to *Job. 14, 28*? So that 'tis evident, the Instance of *Pharaoh* upon the Throne, and *Joseph* administering his Government, is directly *against* Him; proving such a Distinction of Person, as his Notion will not admit of. But *Secondly*, why doth the Objector argue for an *Equality* in *Nature* and *Powers* in the Divine Persons? This again destroys his Notion of *Subordination*. For two individual Persons equal in *Nature* and *Powers*, must needs be *equally independent* and *supreme*; Therefore if the Son of God be *Equal* to the Father in *Nature* and *Powers*, he must [notwithstanding any Pretence of Generation or

Derivation] have *equal Independency* and *Supremacy*; And two such Persons will unavoidably be two Gods; Which also is contrary to the Objector's *Design*, tho' the direct *Consequence* of his Argument. *Generation* or *Derivation* in the Son of God from the *Father*, does indeed prove a *Subordination*; but not such an one as the Objector contends for, [which is really none at all;] but such an one as Dr Clarke and Others suppose; *viz.* a *Subordination* in *Nature* and *Powers*. This is plain, because the Divine Nature, being uncompounded and absolutely Indivisible, cannot admit of such a Separation of Parts, as in humane Generation makes distinct Persons of *equal Nature* and *Powers*; and therefore whatever is generated or deriv'd from God, must be of *Subordinate* and distinct *Nature* and *Powers*. That which deceives the Querist and other Defenders of the vulgar Scholastick Notion, and by which they deceive Others, is; that they imagine a *modal* or *nominal* Subordination to be founded on *Generation* and *Procession* in the distinct Divine Persons, (which yet they hold to be *Individually consubstantial*, and absolutely equal in *Nature* and *Powers*;) because they conceive a Subordination in *humane* Persons (who are *Specifically consubstantial*;) on Account of *Filiation* and *Paternity*. But herein is a *double Fallacy*; *First*, in the *Distinction* of Persons; *Secondly*, in their *Subordination*. The Reason why Generation in *humane* Kind makes *distinct* Persons, is (as I before observ'd) because the Offspring receives by Separation of Parts, not the *individual* but *specifick* Substance of the Parent, which is invested by the *Power* of God with a *distinct* individual personal Subsistence; So that where the Substance is *undivided*, there
can

can be no *such* Generation of *distinct* Persons from it; the Foundation of *That*, being (as I said) a Division of Parts, and a separate Existence. Therefore in the one supreme Divine Nature, which is absolutely indivisible (as the Objector allows,) there can be no *such* Generation or Distinction of Persons, *metaphysically* *Consubstantial* with each other. We may indeed conceive it to have different *Attributes* subsisting in it, or (was it not immutable) we might conceive it to be the Subject of different *Modes*; But *Neither* of these (I hope) can reasonably be thought to be the Objector's Notion of the Divine Persons. But, *Secondly*, could we suppose a *Distinction* of *real* Persons in the same *individual* Divine Nature, yet there could be no *real* Subordination amongst them. The same *individual* Nature, invested with the *same* Powers which are the Result of it, must needs make the Persons, which are nothing but the Nature invested with the Powers, co-ordinate and absolutely equal; and three *such* Divine Persons, would be three equally supreme Gods. A *Man* and his *Son*, are not *really* subordinate any way in *Person*; *Paternity* in one with Regard to the other, is indeed a superior *Relation*, necessarily depending on the *constituted* Order of Things, wherein there must be Priority and Posteriority; but it neither maketh the *Person* of the Father *Greater*, nor the *Person* of the Son *Less*; so that they being equal in *Nature* and natural Powers, there can be no *real* Subordination in their *Persons* on Account of *Paternity* and *Filiation*: At least, the *Relation* of *Paternity* will never give such a Superiority to the Father over the Son, as the Subordination of the second and third Divine Persons to the one supreme God the Fa-

ther, mentioned throughout the Scripture, necessarily implies. But because *humane* Persons are *All* alike *dependent*, and subsist by the Power and Will of a superiour Agent, in whose Hands they are *only Instruments* in generating one another; tho' they are *co-ordinate* in their *natural Persons*, as being *equal* in *Nature* and *natural Powers*; yet God can make a *Subordination* amongst them, either by investing some particular Persons with *supernatural Powers*, as *Prophets* and *Workers of Miracles*; or with particular Instances of *Authority*, as *Fathers* and *Heads of Families*; or by permitting Many to put the *Government* of their Persons into the Hands of *one*, which makes *Kings and Rulers* superiour to their *Subjects*. In *These* Instances, there is a *relative Superiority* with *Regard* to *Powers adventitious* and *extrinsic* to their Persons as *Men*; but there is *not* a *Superiority* in their *natural Persons*: For still, *independent Princes*, and *Persons equally endowed with supernatural Powers* (tho' perhaps related as *Father and Son*), are *co-ordinate*. So that hence I conclude, that wherever there is a *real Subordination* amongst *Men*, it cannot be in their *natural Persons*, but in *supernatural or adventitious Powers* invested in their *natural Persons*. And this is the true State of the Case, in the Instance of *Pharaoh and Joseph*. With *Regard* to their *natural Persons*, they were *equal* in *Nature* and *natural Powers*; There was no *Subordination* at all in their Persons, as *Men*: But in their *adventitious Powers* as *Rulers*, they were *not equal*; and therefore the *Subordination* betwixt them consisted in That. Had *Joseph* been *absolutely equal* to *Pharaoh* in *Authoritative Ruling Powers*, as he was in *Nature and natural Powers*; there would

would have been a *perfect Co-ordination* betwixt Them; and they would have been equally independent and supreme Governours: But (whatever the Objector may think or argue,) a *delegated and derived Power* will always be really *less and unequal* to an *independent and unde-
rived Power*; and a King upon the Throne, exercising an Original and underiv'd Power, will be Superiour to his Subject or Son (who is yet his Subject,) tho' administering the *whole Affairs* of the Government by a *delegated Power* in Subordination to Him. Therefore the Instance is directly *opposite* to Dr Clarke's Scheme, which founds the Subordination of the Divine Persons in *Nature and Powers*; but not at all to the Objector's Scheme, which supposeth a *Subordination of Person* to be consistent with an *absolute Equality both of Nature and Powers*: [not to take Notice, that I have *supposed* in this Argument a *Distinction* of Persons to be consistent with his Scheme, tho' it really is not, as hath been proved.] This the Defenders of the scholastick Notion must either grant, or talk no more of *Distinction* and *Subordination* of Person. For an *Individual Consubstantiality* is inconsistent with a *Distinction*, and much more with a *Subordination* of Person; and a *specifick Consubstantiality*, absolutely and *metaphysically* such, is inconsistent with the *Indivisibility* of the Divine Nature; and, were it not, would still be inconsistent with a *real Subordination* of Person, and introduce *Polytheism*. Wherefore it necessarily remains, that, since there are reveal'd in Scripture three *distinct* Divine Persons in a *Subordination*, the Subordination *must* consist in *Nature and Powers*.

TEXTS concerning Divine Adoration and Worship.

To the one God,

To Christ.

EXOD. 20. 3. *Thou shalt have no other Gods before Me.*

Matt. 4. 10. *It is written, thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve.*

Luk. 24. 52. *They worshipped Him.*

Heb. 1. 6. *Let all the Angels of God worship Him.*

Joh. 5. 23. *That all Men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father.*

CONSIDERATIONS on the foregoing Texts.

WITH the Texts here offered by the learned Objector, and particularly with those Words, *That all Men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father*; compare the Words immediately foregoing and following; *Joh. 5; 22, 23, The Father judgeth no Man, but hath committed all Judgment to the Son: That all Men should honour the Son even as they honour the Father: He that honoureth not the Son, but honoureth not the Father which hath sent him.* Also so Phil. 2, 11, *That every Tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the Glory of God the Father.* Joh. 14, 13, *That the Father may be glorify'd in his Son.* It was the Prayer of Christ, to glorify his Father; and the Father only, is the Object to which He commands us to direct our Prayers, agreeably to the comprehensive Form of his own Prayer. It was

the constant Practice of the Apostles, to pray and give Thanks to God through Jesus Christ; and it is the very End and Design of the Gospel-revelation, to bring us to God in all our Addresses, by the Mediation of his only-begotten Son. The Texts to this Purpose, which are many, undeniably teach us, that God the Father is, as the Fountain of Being and Perfections, so also of Divine Adoration and Worship: As He alone is the one supreme God, supreme Honour and Worship is, only and peculiarly due to him: Whatever Honour is paid to any other, particularly to his Son our Lord and Saviour; is *commanded*, upon Account of his ineffable *Relation to God*, as being the Only-begotten Son and Heir of all Things; and the *distinct* Perfections of his Character and Offices to us-wards, reveal'd in Scripture: And this Honour and Worship, how great soever, doth not terminate in the Son, but redounds to the Glory of the *Father*; who both *begat* Him, and gave Him Dominion over us. Hence the Scriptures alledg'd by the learned Author, and those which I have proposed to be compar'd with them, are clearly reconcilable in *Dr Clarke's* Sense of Subordination in the Divine Persons; but cannot possibly be so, in any other Sense. For if the Son is a *distinct Co-ordinate Person*, 'tis evident that all the Honour given to Him, must centre in his Person, and can go no further; which is directly contrary to the whole Tenour of Scripture. If He be the *individual Substance of the Father*, then can He receive no Honour distinct from the Father; which again is contrary to many Places of Scripture; particularly, *Rev. 1; 5, 6, Unto Him that loved us and washed us from our Sins in his own Blood,*

Of Divine Adoration

Blood, and bath made us Kings and Priests to God and his Father, (or to his God and Father,) to Him be Glory and Dominion for ever and ever. Here is an Honour paid to the Son, which could not be paid to the Father. But since it was by the good Pleasure of the Father, that the Son did That, for which this Honour is paid to Him, viz. redeemed us in Order to reconcile us and bring us to God and his Father; 'tis evident that all the Honour given to the Son who redeemed us, redounds primarily or ultimately to the Honour of the Father, by whose Power and Will only, he did and could redeem us. But if the Father and Son be the same individual Godhead, then all Distinction of Honour vanisheth: The Father then may as properly be said to do all Things finally to the Glory of the Son, and all his Honours tend to and redound to the Honour of the Son; and we to pay all Worship, Adoration and Thanksgiving, to the Son by the Father, as *vice versa*. But this plainly inverts and confounds the whole Scriptures, and in Truth and Reality deprives the Son of God of all Manner of Honour: For hereby, when we pray, and give Thanks to, and worship the Son, 'tis indeed only the Father or one God under another Name; and consequently the *meer* Man Jesus Christ, in whom the Power and Perfection of the Father are manifested in an extraordinary Manner. It will be difficult for the Defenders of the Scholastick Notion, on This Account, to come off from the Charge of Idolatry, so freely by them cast upon the Socinians; and I desire to know distinctly and in plain Words, without Equivocation or Metaphysical Sophistry wherein lies the Difference betwixt the Socinians and themselves in this Matter. But on the other

Other Hand, if our Lord Jesus Christ be a distinct subordinate Being or Person, then the scriptures are all Harmony, and perfectly agreeable to themselves throughout. Whatever Honour is or can be paid to the Son, results finally to the Glory of the Father, and is individually distinct from it. If we worship the Son for what He is in *Himself*, as the *Only-begotten of the Father*; this plainly terminates in the Glory of *His* Power and Goodness, who begat Him: If we worship Him for what He is to *Us*, as our Lord, our Redeemer, and our Judge; this also centres in the Glory of *Him*, by whose Power He was enabled to make and govern us, and by whose Wisdom, Love, Mercy, and Justice he was sent to redeem, and will be sent to judge us. So that in This Way, the Son hath all Divine Honour that can be communicated to one which is derived; and yet the Father doth not give his Glory to another, but is *Alone* Honoured as the one supreme Cause and Original of all Things, and particularly as the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Whether by these and the like Texts, Adoration and Worship be not so appropriated to the one God, as to belong to Him only?

Whether, notwithstanding, Worship and Adoration be not equally due to Christ; and consequently whether it must not follow that He is the one God, and not a distinct inferiour Being, as the Arians suppose?

By the Texts alledged, *Exod*, 20, 3; *Mat. Answ. to* 10; absolute supreme Honour is plainly appropriated to the Person of the Father only, as the

the absolute supreme Being, or The One God.

Ans. to
2d.

Equality of Divine Honour, is never attributed in Scripture to the Son with the Father. For then the Son would be *absolutely equal* with the Father, which is contrary to Scripture and Reason. But whatever Honour is due to the Son, is *subordinate*, and to and from the Glory of the Father. I wonder the learned Author did not perceive, that the Texts which He offers, *Heb. 1, 6; Job. 23*; evidently prove This. As to the Infirmary concerning *Arianism*; All who are skilled in Ecclesiastical History, know that the Error of *Arius* did not consist in the making the Son *distinct* from, and *really subordinate* to the Father; (for That always was the *Christian* Doctrine;) But his Error consisted, in *presuming* to affirm, upon the Principles of his own uncertain Philosophy, and without Warrant of Scripture, that the Son was *ὁ ἕκτος* and that *ὁ ἕκτος*, *ὁ ἕκτος* *ὁ ἕκτος*.

Qu. 3d.

Whether Worship and Adoration both from Men and Angels, was not due to Him, long before the Commencing of his Mediatorial Kingdom, He was their Creator and Preserver; See Col. 1, 16, 17. And whether That be not the same Title to Adoration, that God the Father hath, Author and Governour of the Universe, upon the Doctor's own Principles?

Ans.

Tho' the World was created by the Son, yet no Adoration was due to him upon That Account either from Angels or from Men, because it was no Act of Dominion, and he did *merely Ministerially*; just as no Adoration is now due from us to Angels, for the Be-

its they convey to us, because they do it merely instrumentally. 'Tis the having a Throne, a Dominion, a Kingdom, a Power of Judging, that is the only Foundation of Adoration. And therefore Adoration was due to Christ from Angels and Men, as soon as his Regal Power was re-reveal'd to them, and God commanded Him to be worshipped; but plainly could not be due before. Christ's Mediatorial Kingdom commenc'd indeed from the Beginning of the Creation, as soon as Man was fallen, according to Rev. 13, 8, He is the Lamb slain from the Foundation of the World: But this Kingdom was not proclaimed, till after his Resurrection from the Dead; And from thence, I think, commenc'd our Worship of Him in his own distinct Person and Character: Rev. 5, 9; They sung a NEW Song, saying, &c. And though he was from the Beginning in the Form of God, yet he did not assume to himself to be honoured like unto God, till, after his Humiliation, God highly exalted him, and commanded that at the Name of Jesus every knee should bow: See Philip. 2, 6, in the Original. Also Heb. 5, 5, Christ glorified not Himself, to be made an High-Priest; but HE that said unto him, Thou art my Son, to Day have I begotten thee. The latter Part of the Querie, hath been already sufficiently answer'd under the 4th Querie of the first Head of Argument.

Whether the Doctor has not given a very partial Qu. 4h. account of Joh. 5, 23; founding the Honour due to the Son upon This only, that the Father hath committed all Judgment to the Son; when the true Reason assigned by our Saviour, and illustrated by several Instances in the Verses going before and after, is, That the Son doth the same Things that the Father doeth, hath the same Power and Authority

Authority of doing what He will; and therefore has a Title to as great Honour, Reverence and Regard, as the Father Himself hath? And it is no Objection against this, that the Son is there said to do nothing of Himself, or to have all Given Him by the Father; since it is own'd that the Father is the Fountain of all, from whom the Son derives in an ineffable Manner his Essence and Power, so as to be one with Him.

*Ans. to
4th.*

The only Honour due to our Saviour, is plainly suppos'd by St John to be given Him upon Account of his being appointed by the Father to judge the World. This the Context clearly shews, and the following five or six Verses confirm; which entirely relate to the two great Branches of this Office, the Power of raising the Dead, and the Disposal of everlasting Life and Damnation. The Argument which the learned Author alledges on the other Side is, that in this fifth Chapter, the Son is said to do the same Things which the Father doth, hath the same Power and Authority of doing what He will, and therefore has a Title to as great Honour, Reverence and Regard, as the Father Himself hath. Here I confess I cannot but with some Amazement observe an evident Instance, how Prejudice blinds the Minds of even learned and honest Men. If our Lord had purposely designed in the most express and emphatical Manner to declare his real Subordination and Dependence on the Father, He could not have done it more fully and clearly than He hath in this whole Chapter. When the Jews falsely and maliciously charged Him with making Himself equal with God, v. 18; He declares, v. 19, that He was so far from doing so, that He could do Nothing of Himself, but only what He sees the Father do, that is, what the Father hath given Him

Him
not in
43.
cified,
is no
Lord.
shewet
theref
Name
assum
with
must
ing of
ween
iv'd
he lea
on can
is a
Fountain
of th
udes,
mean
e noth
much c
office
nor wo
ity of
v'd th
effable
nat, le
Deri
as gen
dividu
e Part
(m) Yet
nce; an

Him

Him Power and Commission to do; and this not in his own, but in his Father's Name, *ver.* 43. Further, this Power which the Son exercised, was *given* Him not by *Necessity*, (which is *no Gift*,) but by *free Love*; for, saith our Lord, *ver.* 20, *the Father loveth the Son, and sheweth Him all Things that Himself doth.* If therefore to be freely sent, and to act in the Name and by the Authority of another, be to assume an Equality of Honour and Regard with That Other by whom He was sent; we must for ever despair to understand the Meaning of Words, or to be able to distinguish between a delegated, and a supreme or undiv'd Power. What is still more surprizing; the learned Author acknowledgeth, that *The Son can do nothing of Himself, and that his Power is all given Him, and that the Father is the Fountain of all, and that the very Essence and Power of the Son is deriv'd from Him*; yet He concludes, that He (the Son) is *one with Him*, meaning one *individual* Essence, or else it can be nothing to the Purpose.) I have said so much concerning This before, that it shall here suffice to take Notice, that the learned Author would seem to shrou'd a little the Absurdity of his Notion, by saying that the Son deriv'd the *individual* Essence of the Father in an *ineffable Manner*: But is it not self-evident, that, let the *Manner* of the Son's Generation or Derivation be ever *so ineffable*, if *any Thing* was generated or deriv'd, it must be a *distinct individual* Essence or Substance? It could not be *Part (m)* of the Father's Substance: That is

H

absurd.

(m) Yet *Tertullian* expressly makes it *Part* of the Father's Substance; and thence (as Absurdities grow by Degrees) it came to be at last

absurd. And to say it was the *Whole*, is so flagrant a Contradiction, that I question whether there *can* be a greater in the Nature and Reason of Things. Can the *same individual Substance* be *derived*, and *underiv'd*? or can there be a *Communication*, and *nothing Communicated*? For it is suppos'd that the *whole Essence or Substance* is *communicated* to the *Son*, and yet remains *whole* and *uncommunicated* in the *Father*; which is evidently *to be*, and *not to be*, at the same Time. I really think the Defenders of the Scholastick Notion, may be ashamed of speaking of the *Equivocations* of the *Arians*, when they are forc'd to support themselves by this Kind of Reasoning.

Qu. 5th.

Whether the Doctor need have cited 300 Texts wide of the Purpose, to prove what no Body denies, namely a Subordination, in some Sense, of the Son to the Father; could he have found but one plain Text against his Eternity or Consubstantiality, the Points in Question?

Ans. to 5th.

If the Doctor's 300 Texts prove a *Real Subordination*, and not in *Name* only; the Point is gain'd against (what no One Text can be alleged for,) the Querist's Notion of *Individual Consistent Substantiality*; unless the same individual intelligent Substance can be *subordinate* to itself, and *consubstantial* with itself. And as to the

Notion

last the *Whole*. "The Father (saith Tertullian) is the *whole Substance*; [*filius vero Derivatio totius, & Portio, sicut ipse profitetur quia Pater major Me est,*] but the Son is a Derivation from, and Part of the *Whole*; as He Himself Professeth, saying, *The Father is greater than I.*" Adv. Prax. c. 9. Thus likewise in Other Places. And yet *Tertullian* is the chief Evidence in all *Antenicene Antiquity*, whom the Defenders of the Scholastick Notion depend for their Application of the *Trinity*.

Notion of *Eternity*, it has been at large considered above.

Whether He be not forced to supply his Want of Qu. 6th. Scripture-Proof, by very strain'd and remote Inferences, and very uncertain Reasoning from the Nature of a Thing confessedly obscure and above Comprehension; and yet not more so, than God's Eternity, Ubiquity, Prescience, or other Attributes, which yet we are forced to acknowledge?

To the *Former Part of the Querie*, I answer *Ans. to 6th.* directly in the *Negative*: To the latter; I answer, that God's *Attributes* are so far from being above *Comprehension*, that they are all strictly demonstrable by Reason. But I am willing to suppose that the Author meant, that the *Manner* of their Existence in the Divine Nature is above *Comprehension*; and so indeed it is; But then this is plainly nothing to the Purpose: For tho' the *Manner* of the Son's *Derivation* is above *Comprehension*, yet his *real Subordination* is strictly demonstrable from Scripture-evidence.

Whether his whole Performance, whenever He differs from Us, be any Thing more than a Repetition of this one Assertion, that Being and Person are the same; or that there's no Medium between Tritheism and Sabellianism? Which is removing the Cause from Scripture to natural Reason, not very consistently with the Title of his Book.

As for the *Doctor's Performance*, the learned *Ans. to 7th.* World must be the Judges of it. But if He had done no more than prov'd *Intelligent Being*

and *Person* to be the same ; it must for ever remain an *unanswerable* Difficulty in the *Scholastick* Scheme, that they hold three distinct *subordinate* (which yet they call *equal*) *Persons* or intelligent Beings, in *one individual Nature* or Substance. The *Doctor* no where asserts or supposeth, that there is no *Medium* between *Tritheism* and *Sabellianism* ; but every where the contrary : His *own* Scheme being manifestly such a *Medium*. Had the Author said that the *Doctor* allowed no *Medium* for his *Adversaries*, between *Tritheism* and *Sabellianism* ; it had been true. I wonder a learned *Person* should make so palpable a Mistake. I desire the Author to consider a second Time, and tell me, whether the Profession of three Divine Persons or Beings in a *real and true Subordination*, can with any Reason be call'd *Tritheism* ? (n) If He is positive in the *Affirmative*, I promise to bring both *Antenicene* and *Nicene Fathers*, as well as the plain Reason of the Thing, against Him : If he agrees with me in the *Negative*, I trust He will perceive his Mistake of the *Doctor's* Assertion.

SECT.

(n) There is nothing more clearly revealed in Scripture, nor more necessarily deduced from natural Reason, than that the *Unity* of God is an *Unity* of *personal Supremacy*, and independent *Self-Origination*. And the ancient Writers of the Church unanimously agree, that nothing but an absolute *Equality* and *Co-ordination* in God the Father and the Son, can make them to be two *Gods* ; and that the *real Subordination* of the Son to the Father, preserves the Church from *Polytheism*. Novatian is very express. *Si natus non fuisset ; innatus comparatus cum eo qui esset innatus, æquatione in utroq; ostensū duos faceret innatos, & ideo duos faceret Deos ;* — “ If the Son (saith He) was not “ begotten ; it would follow, that being Self-existent, and compar'd “ with Him (with the Father) who is Self-existent, their *Equality*

“ in

"in this Respect, as being two Self-existents, would make two Gods." Eusebius also speaks the Sense of all Antiquity, when he saith ; ἡ δὲ φύσις αὐτοῖς ἐμποδίζει, μήτις ἄρα δύο θεοὺς ἀναγνέμεν δεῖται ἐπίγνωσαν, ὡς τὸ υἱὸς πρὸς ἡμῶν ὁμολογούμεν θεῷ, οἷς ἂν γένοιτο μόνῳ Θεῷ ἐκείνῳ ὁ μόνῳ ἀναρχῷ καὶ ἀγέννητῷ, ὁ τὸν θεοῦ οἰκίαν κακισμὸν. αὐτῷ δὲ ἴσῳ υἱῷ τὸ εἶναι καὶ τὸ ποιῆσαι εἶναι γεροντὶς ἀλλήῳ. — Μιᾶς δὲ ἔσσης ἀρχῆς τε καὶ κεφαλῆς, πῶς ἂν γένοιτο θεοὶ δύο ; " if this makes them apprehensive, lest we should seem to introduce Two Gods ; let them know, that tho' we do indeed acknowledge the Son to be God, yet there is [absolutely] but one God ; even He who Alone is without Original and unbegotten, who has his Divinity properly of Himself, and is the Cause even to the Son Himself, both of his Being, and of his being such as He is. — Thus there being but one Original, and one Head, how can there be Two Gods ?" De Eccles. Theol. lib. 1. C. 11. Again : 'Οὐδὲ δύο θεοὺς ἀνάγκη εἶναι, ἴδοντες δύο ὑποστάσεις πθέντα. 'Οὐδὲ γὰρ δύο ἰσότητες αὐτὰς οὐκ εἰσὶν, ἡ δὲ ἀμφὶ ἀναρχίας καὶ ἀγέννητης· ἀλλὰ μίαν μὲν ἴδον ἀγέννητον καὶ ἀναρχον πατέρα καὶ γεννητὴν, καὶ ἀρχὴν τὸν πατέρα κακισμὸν ; " neither is it necessary that he who supposeth two distinct subsisting Beings, must make Two Gods ; for we do not suppose them both to be Co-ordinate, or Both to be unoriginated and unbegotten ; but one, unbegotten and unoriginated ; the other, begotten and originated from the Father." Lib. 2, Cap. 7. Again : 'Οὐ γὰρ δύο ἀγέννητα, ἡ δὲ δύο ἀναρχα, ἡ δὲ δύο ἐσὶαι ἔξ ἰσότητος ἀντιπαρεξαρμέναι ἀλλήλοις εἰσάγοντες· οὐδὲ δύο θεοὺς· ἀλλὰ μίαν ἀρχὴν καὶ θεὸν εἶναι, τὸν αὐτὸν πατέρα διδάσκοντες εἶναι τὸ μονογενὲς καὶ ἀγαπῶν υἱὸς ; " The Church of God doth not introduce two unbegotten Beings, nor two unoriginated, nor two Essences Co-ordinate to each other ; and therefore not two Gods. But it teaches that there is one Original of Things, one God ; and that He is the Father of the only-begotten and beloved Son : " lib. 2. C. 23. Let Athanasius speak the Sense of the Nicene and Post-nicene Fathers ; Μίαν οἰοῦμεν καὶ μόνῳ θεῷ ἴσην, τὸν τῷ πατρὶ τῷ λόγον καὶ σοφίαν εἶναι τὸν υἱόν καὶ ἑαυτοῦ πνεύοντες, ἡ λέγουμεν δύο θεοὺς ; " We acknowledge one only Divinity, even that of the Father ; and that the Son is his Word and Wisdom : And so believing, we do not make Two Gods." De Synod. This is also the Sense of Hilary, and Basil ; as Dr Clarke hath prov'd at large, Script. Doct. Part 2. Notes on §. 39. And our learned Bishop Pearson saith ; " It is most reasonable to assert that there is but one Person who is from none (viz. the Father :) and that if there were more than one which were from none, it cou'd not be deny'd but that there were more Gods than one ; wherefore (He saith) this Self-origination in the Divine Paternity, hath anciently been look'd upon as the Assertion of the Unity : " Expos. on the Creed. P. 40. And the learned Bishop Bull : Ex veterum Sententia, cui ratio communis suffragatur ; si duo in Divinitate essent inenita, sive principia à se pendentia, consequens foret, ut non modo Patris sua privaretur ἐξοχῇ, qua Divinitatem a seipso, hoc est, a nullo alio habet

babet; verum etiam ut duo Dii necessario statuereatur: Contra, posita Subordinatione, qual Pater solus a seipso Deus, Filius vero de Deo Patre Deus esse docetur; putarunt Doctores, tum illam Patris *ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ*, tum divinam monarchiam in tuto iri collocatum; "According to the Opinion of the Ancients (saith He,) to which also common Sense agrees; "If there were in the Divinity two unbegotten or two independent Principles, it would follow not only that the Father would be deprived of that Pre-eminence by which he hath his Divinity of himself, that is, from no other; but also that we must needs make "Two Gods: But now on the contrary, if we allow That Subordination, by which the Father Alone is God of himself, and the Son "is God from God the Father; then those ancient Writers thought, "that both the Pre-eminence of the Father, and the Monarchy of the "Universe would be preserv'd entire." *Señ. 4. l. 4. §. 2.*

S E C T. II.

As to R E A S O N.

Qu. 1st. **T**HE Difficulty in the Conception of the Trinity, is (saith the learned Querist,) how three Persons can be but one God. Does the Doctor deny, that every one of the Persons singly is God? No. Does he deny, that God is One? No. How then are the Three One?

Ans^r. The Difficulty which the Objector conceives in the Trinity, of three Persons being but one God, is entirely removed by Dr Clarke's Scheme; which doth not suppose three Persons to be The one individual God, in any Sense whatsoever; but that the One God, or God absolutely speaking, is the First Person in the Trinity: According to those most express Texts of Scripture, Rom. 15, 30, for — Jesus Christs sake, and for the Love of the Spirit, — strive in your Prayers to G O D. 1 Cor. 12; 4, 5, 6, The same Spirit, — the same Lord, —

the same G O D. 1 Cor. 13, 14, *The Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Love of G O D, and the Communion of the Holy Ghost.* Ephes. 4; 4, 5, 6, *One Spirit, — One Lord, — One G O D and Father of all.* Jude 20, 21, *In the Holy Ghost, — in the Love of G O D, — for the Mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ.* And whereas the Objector answers for the Doctor, that He doth not deny *that every one of the Persons singly is God*; he should however have taken Notice (if he would have represented him fully and fairly,) that *Dr Clarke* expressly observes, that the *Holy Spirit* is never directly call'd *God* or *Lord* in *Scripture*, (but the *Spirit of God*, or the *Spirit of the Lord*;) and gives Reason for it. He proceeds; *does he deny that God is one?* And answers rightly, *No.* He concludes; *How then are the Three [Unum] One?* I Answer; *very easily and clearly*, from what has been above said: Tho' the *Scripture* it self never says that *Three are one*, but in That Text which has been plainly demonstrated to be Spurious, both by *Dr Clarke* in his Letter to *Dr Wells*, and in his Reply to *Mr Nelson*; and also since by an anonymous Author, in a Book entituled, *a Full Enquiry into the Original Authority of That Text*, 1 Job. 5, 7.

Does one and the same Authority exercis'd by Qu. 2d. All, make them one, numerically or individually one and the same God? It is hard to conceive how three distinct Beings, according to the Doctor's Scheme, can be individually one God, that is, three Persons be one Person. If therefore One God necessarily signifies but one Person; the Consequence is irresistible, either that the Father is That one Person, and none else, which is downright

right Sabellianism; or that the three Persons, are three Gods. Thus the Doctor's Scheme is liable to the very same Difficulties with the other. There is indeed one easy Way of coming off; and That is, by saying that the Son and Holy Spirit are neither of them God in the Scripture-Sense of the Word. But then this is Cutting the Knot, instead of Untying it; and is in Effect to say, that they are not called God in Scripture.

Qu. 3d.

Does the Communication of Divine Powers and Attributes from Father to Son and Holy Spirit, make them one God; the Divinity of the two latter, being the Father's Divinity? Why, yet the same Difficulty recurs. For either the Son and Holy Spirit have distinct Attributes and a distinct Divinity of their own, or they have not. If they have, they are distinct Gods, from the Father; and as much, as Finite from Infinite, Creature from Creator; and then, how are they one? If they have not; then, since they have no other Divinity but that individual Divinity and those Attributes which are inseparable from the Father's Essence, they can have no distinct Essence, from the Father's; and so, according to the Doctor, will be one and the same Person, that is, will be Names only.

Qu. 4th.

Whether this be not as unintelligible as the Orthodox Notion of the Trinity, and liable to the like Difficulties? A Communication of Divine Powers and Attributes without the Substance, being as hard to conceive, nay much harder, than a Communication of Both together, which is the vulgar Notion. And herein lies the main Point of Difference, between Us and the Doctor.

Ans.

It would be a sufficient Reply to the three foregoing Queries, to tell the Author, that
to d, 3d, and 4th, had

had He at all *understood Dr Clarke's Books*, He would not have offered them. They are such gross Mistakes, that I could not easily imagine a learned Person to fall into them. Can He think *Dr Clarke* does or would say, that the *individual Powers and Attributes* of the one God the Father, are or can be communicated to the second and third Divine Persons either *with* or *without* the Essence? This indeed would be absurd, and equally unintelligible with the *Scholastick Scheme*, which the *Querist* calls *Orthodox*. But *Dr Clarke* doth not suppose the Divine Persons to be *individually* or *numerically* one and the same God, in any Sense either of Authority or Powers or Essence or any other Way. This the Author might easily have learn'd from the *Doctor's Reply's*, pag. 230, cited by Himself; where he expressly tells Him, *Nothing that is individual, can ever be communicated from any one Thing to another*; and gives an *unanswerable Reason* for it: And withal tells Him, *that the World well understands what is meant by Communication of Knowledge, Power, and the like*. I hope the learned Author is not such a Stranger to the World, as to be ignorant of this. So that all the Difficulties in conceiving a *Trinity in Unity*, which the learned Author speaks of, in *Dr Clarke's Scheme*; is only rais'd by his own Imagination, without any Ground at all from the *Doctor's Books*. How then are the Father and Son one, (o) as *Dr Clarke* indeed, and truly, saith that they

(o) The Scripture (as I before observed) never says that the Father and Son are *one God*, but [*unum*] *one Thing in Effect*. And of the *Three Persons* it never says, that They are either *one God*, or *Unum* at

they are? I Answer: *First*, They are *One*, morally and rationally, that is, in Concord and Agreement of Mind and Will; and in the subordinate Exercise of *one and the same Power or Authority*, viz. that of the Father. The Son is ever obedient to and beloved of the Father,

at all; except only in that confessedly Spurious Text, cited as *St John's*, 1 Epist. 5, 7. The Defenders of the *Scholastick Explication* of the *Trinity in Unity*, tho' they pretend much that the most ancient Writers of the Church are on their Side; yet in expressing their Notion of the *Unity* in the Divine Persons, they do not only leave *Scripture and Reason*, but plainly run against the whole Stream of *Antiquity* also. The Text on which they so much rely, *Joh. 10, 30, I and my Father are one*; is understood by *Textullian* Himself, of the Unity of Love and Consent and Power: *Unum sumus, non, unus sumus. — Unum dicit, neutrali verbo; quod non pertinet ad Singularitatem, sed ad Unitatem, ad Similitudinem, ad Conjunctionem; ad Dilectionem Patris, qui Filium diligit; et ad Obsequium Filii, qui Voluntati Patris obsequitur. — "I and my Father are one Thing [saith He,] not one Person. For, one Thing in the neuter Gender, does not express Identity, but Union, Likeness, Conjunction; the Love of the Father towards the Son and the Obedience of the Son to the Will of his Father."* Again, citing the Words, *that ye may know and believe that the Father is in Me and I in Him*, *Joh. 10, 38*; his Comment is; *Per opera erat Pater in Filio, & Filius in Patre; & ita per opera intelligimus unum esse Patrem et Filium &c.* "By the Works was the Father in the Son, and the Son in the Father; and so we understand the Father and Son to be *One*, by the Works:" *Adv. Prax. cap. 22.* Thus also *Novatian*. *Si erat, ut heretici putant, Pater Christus, oportuit dicere, Ego & Pater Unus sumus. — Unum neutraliter positum, societatis Concordiam, non Unitatem Personæ sonat. — Ut merito sit Unum Pater & Filius, per Concordiam & per Amorem. — Novit hanc Concordiæ Unitatem & Apostolus Paulus, cum Personarum tamen Distinctione; — qui plantat, & qui rigat, Unum sunt. Quis autem non intelligat alterum esse Apollo, alterum Paulum, non eundem atq; ipsum Apollo pariter & Paulum?* "If Christ (saith He) had been the Father, as the *Hereticks* imagine; He would have said, *I and my Father Am One [unus, One Person.] But One in the Neuter Gender [Unum, one Thing,] signifies Agreement of Fellowship, not Unity of Person: So that the Father and Son are one Thing by Agreement and Love. The Apostle Paul also takes Notice of this Unity of Agreement, with a Difference of Persons; He that planteth [saith He]*

the
I b
sen
sho
eve
unt
tho
Ag
my
On
Ch
ch.
We
last
Uni
mu
Ch
ther
mun
to
infi
sho
Her
are
be
Div
in

" He
" kn
" Pa
Clar
sostom
stand
er;
preffe
Power
Bul
Celf.

ther, as He Himself saith, *Job. 12 ; 49, 50,*
I have not spoken of my self, but the Father which
sent Me, He gave Me a Commandment, what I
should say and what I should speak :—Whatso-
ever I speak therefore, even as the Father said
unto Me, so I speak. Joh. 8, 29, I do always
those Things which Please Him (the Father.)
Again, I honour my Father &c. I do the Will of
my Father which sent Me. Secondly ; They are
One in the Care and Preservation of the
Church ; agreeably to the Words of St John,
ch. 10, 30, I and my Father are one. Which
Words, according to the Principles of the Scho-
lastick Writers, can never reasonably mean an
Unity of Nature ; because, in Their Way, they
must needs relate to the humane Nature of
Christ spoken of immediately before : The Fa-
ther who gave them Me, (that is, as These men
must necessarily understand it, who gave them
to my Humanity ; for it is impossible that the
infinite all-sufficient Being, or God Himself,
should receive any Thing ;) is greater than all :
Hence if the following Words, I and my Father
are one, express an Unity of Essence ; it must
be betwixt the Humanity of Christ, and the
Divinity of the Father. Thirdly ; They are One
in Testimony to the Truth ; according to
That

“ He] and He that watereth, are One [one Thing:] Now every Body
 “ knows, that yet *Apollos* was one Man, and *Paul* another, and not
 “ *Paul* and *Apollos* one and the same Man,” *cap. 22.* See *Dr*
Clarke’s Reply to Mr Nelson’s Friend, pag. 153, 154, 155. *Chry-*
ostome and *Basil* also. (whatever their Own Opinion was,) under-
 stand the Text itself, *I and my Father are one,* of an Unity of Pow-
 er ; see *Dr Clark’s Scrip. Doct.* pag. 100, 101. *Justin Martyr* ex-
 presseth the Unity *γνώμῃ*, in Purpose ; *Athenagoras*, *δυνάμει* in
 Power ; *Origen*, *τῇ ὁμονοίᾳ καὶ τῇ συμφωνίᾳ, καὶ τῇ ταυτότητι τῆς*
βουλῆς [Θ], in Agreement and Consent and Sameness of Will ; cont.
Cels. lib. 8. And the Council of *Antioch*, *τῇ συμφωνίᾳ*, in Concord.

That Passage cited as from St John, *There are Three that bear Witness, — and those Three are [Unum] one*: (I will for the present give the Defenders of the Scholastick Notion this *Spurious Text*.) Here again an *individual Unity* of Essence or Substance, is directly contrary to That Text; because one *individual Being*, cannot be *Three Witnesses* to one and the same Truth; but three distinct Persons, or Beings, may: And it was plainly the Design of the Author, to speak of *Three Witnesses*, by mentioning *Three Persons*. As to what the learned Objector saith in the second Querie, *that if one God necessarily signifies but one Person, the Consequence is, either that the Father is That one Person and none else, which is Sabellianism; or that the Three Persons, are Three Gods*: I wonder a learned Person should be so positive in so manifest an Error. The Consequence (he saith) is *irresistible*: But indeed, *Both Parts* of his Consequence (That relating to *Sabellianism* on the one Hand, and That relating to *Tritheism* on the other Hand,) are plainly false. 'Tis Demonstration, that *one God is one Person only*; otherwise *one Person* could not be *one God*: For who sees not, that if *one God* be not *one*, but *two Persons* or *more*; 'tis impossible for *one Person* to be *God*? And yet the Defenders of the Scholastick Notion profess, that the Father *alone* and *distinct* from the Son and Spirit, is *God* or *the one God*. But if the *three Persons* compos'd but *one God*, 'tis evident that each distinct Person, or every Person by Himself (as saith the Creed ascrib'd to *Athanasius*) could not be *God*, but only a Part or Mode or other Denomination of *God*; that is, in Reality, *no God* at all. As for his saying, *that the Notion of one God being one Person only, is Sabellian*;

'tis

tis altogether erroneous: For if by *one Person* he means *one intelligent Agent*, he makes the *Sabellians Catholicks*, and condemns his *own Friends* (who say *Three Persons*,) for *Tritheists*: But if by *Person* he means, not *intelligent Being*, but *Mode or Distinction*, *external or internal*, of *intelligent Being*; then the *Sabellians* did not hold *God* to be *one Person* but *Three*, and were therein *Orthodox*. The Truth is; the *Sabellians* held *One Hypostasis* or *Divine Substance*, in Opposition to the *Church* who professed *Three Hypostases*: And as the *Church* held *Three Hypostases* in a *Subordination*, on the other hand the *Sabellians* gave three distinct *Denominations* (or, as the *Schools* now speak in their *Jargon*, *external Persons*,) to their *One Hypostasis*. I desire to know, *wherein* the *Antenicene Catholicks* and *Dr Clarke* disagree? As also, *wherein* the present *Scholastick* Notion disagrees with the *Sabellian*? It never was nor could be *Sabellianism*, to say that *one God* or *The one God* was *one Person*, or *intelligent Agent* only; and also that *the Father* was this *one God* or *Person*. This is the *express Assertion* of *St Paul*; *To Us there is but one God, even the Father*; And no other *Person* is ever call'd in *Scripture* *The one God*. If it be alledged that *St Paul* does not say, that the *Father only* is the *one God*, but that the *Son* and *Spirit* are included; they will (I trust) be asham'd when they consider that they plainly falsify, *St Paul*: For if the *Father alone* be not the *one God*, but the *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost*; then *St Paul* could not truly say, that the *Father* was the *one God*; because, according to them, the *one God* is not *the Father*, but the *Father* and *Son* and *Holy Ghost*: So that at most, the *Father* is but a *third Part*, or, if That be absurd,

absurd, *one Name* of the *one God*, who hath other two Names besides. But again, by the express Words of *Christ Himself*, the *Father* is *the only true God*; and consequently all other Persons are excluded from being *the only true God*, that are excluded from being *the Father*: So that if *Father* and *Son* and *Holy Ghost* are *the only true God*, then *they are the Father*; and not only so, but *They* will also be the *God and Father* of the *Son*, or of our *Lord Jesus Christ*; because *the only true God*, is his *God and Father*. These Absurdities are altogether unavoidable in the *Scholastick Scheme*. I have sufficiently answer'd for *Dr Clarke's* Notion, not being *Sabellian*; tho' that of his *Adversaries* plainly is so. And that it is not *Tritheistick*, (which was the *Other Part* of the *Objector's Disjunction*;) I have prov'd before. I have only to add, to complete my Answer to the three Queries; that yet the *Son* is *God* truly and properly and by *Nature*, in the *Scripture-Sense* of the Word *God*. And the showing of this, will fully answer his 5th Query which is.

Qu. 5th,

Whether Gal. 4. 8. may not be enough to determine the Dispute between us; since it oblig'd the Dr to confess, that Christ is by Nature truly God as truly as Man is by Nature truly Man? In deed He equivocates there, as usual; as if He meant to make a Jargon of our Language: For He will have it to signify, that Christ is God by Nature, only as having, by That Nature which He derives from the Father, true Divine Power and Dominion, &c. That is; he is truly God by Nature, as having a Nature distinct from and inferior to God's; wanting the most essential Character of God, Self-existence. Wh

(p
very
faith
ex P
" no
" Fa
der
λαμβ
κτεον
πτα
το πα
το δ
δν χ
" Lec
" such
" mu
" no
" Divi
" Ima
" serv
" as
Epist.
very
Novel
Trinity,

is this, but Quibbling with Words, and Playing fast and loose?

Will the Querist insist upon it, that the Son Ans^w. cannot be God by Nature, unless He be (p) Self-existent? How is he then a Son, and begotten? Do the Scriptures, when they say He is the Only-begotten, and First-born, really mean that He is unbegotten, that is, Self-existent? I can assure Him, the learnedest even of his own Friends are ashamed of This, and there are few so hardy as directly to affirm it. But I have prov'd, that, in Scripture, there are different and subordinate Acceptations of the Word God. This appears as plain, as the

(p) Self-existent.] Here the Writers of the primitive Church are very express and unanimous against the Objector's Notion. Novatian saith: *Quicquid est [Filius], non ex se est, quia nec innatus est; sed ex Patre est, quia genitus est: &c.* "Whatsoever the Son is, he is not of himself; because he is not Self-existent; but he is of the Father, because begotten of him." *De Trin. c. 31.* And Alexander Bishop of Alexandria. *Μή τις τὸ ἄει παρὲς ὑπὸ νομίᾳ ἀγεννήτου λαμβάνετω* — ἡ γὰρ τῷ μὲν ἀγεννήτῳ παρὲς οἰκείον ἀξίωμα φύλακτον, μηδὲν αὐτῷ εἶναι αὐτῷ ἢ αἰποῦ λέγοντας. — τῷ μὲν τῷ θεῷ αὐτῷ [υἱ] μὴ παραιτούμενοι, ἀλλὰ τῷ ἐκόντι καὶ τῷ χαρακτηρῶν τῷ πατρὶ ἀπικειβόμενον ἐμφέρειν κατὰ πάντα ἀναπθέντες. — τὸ δὲ ἀγεννητὸν τῷ πατρὶ μόνον ἰδίωμα παρῆναι δεξάζοντες, ὅτε καὶ αὐτὸ φάσκοντες τῷ σωτῆρι, ὁ πατὴρ μὲν μείζων μὲν ἐστίν. "Let no Man imagine, that the Word, Always was, leads to any such Notion, as if the Son was Self-existent. — Therefore we must reserve to the Self-existent Father this peculiar Dignity, that no one is the Cause of his Existence. — Yet not denying the Divinity of the Son; but ascribing to Him who is the express Image of the Father, an exact Likeness in all Things: Only reserving to the Father the peculiar Property of Self-existence; as our Saviour himself declares, *My Father is greater than I.*" *Epist. ad Alex. apud Theodoret. Lib. 1.* Here Alexander, That very Bishop who excommunicated Arius for insisting upon his Novel and unscriptural Expressions in explaining the Doctrine of the Trinity, plainly expresseth his Notion to be That which, after the Council

the different Meaning of any other Word or Title whatsoever. The Title *God*, implies *Divine Dominion*, and *relative Perfections*. *Supremacy of Dominion*, and *Original underived independent Powers*, denominate the *Supreme God*, and are the Character of the *Father* or first Person only; And this *Supremacy* and *Independency*, must be inherent and essential to one individual Subject. *Divine Dominion* and *Power deriv'd* to, and exercis'd by, an intelligent Being or Person; makes That Being or Person to be [*ὁ θεός*] *God*; not the one *Supreme God and Father of all Things*, but *Subordinate*. If this *Divine Power and Dominion* be deriv'd and exercis'd *partially, temporarily, or in certain Emergencies only*; then it makes

Council of Nice, was call'd the *Homoiousian Faith*. And *Constantine the Great*; Ἀρχὴ αὐτὸς οὗτός ἐστις πατὴρ ἀπαρτὸν δὲ ὁ υἱός. "The Father is the Cause of the Son; and the Son is Caused by Him." *Orat. ad Sanct. cœtum*; apud *Euseb.* And *Athanasius* Himself; Ἀρχὴ ἐστὶν ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ φύσις, καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, καὶ τῆς κτίσεως πασις; "The Nature of God is the Cause both of the Son and Holy Spirit, and of all Creatures." *Dissert. Orthodoxi & Anomæi.* And *Basil*; Ἀγέννητον δὲ, εἰς οὗτος ἔξω πατρὶως ἐστὶ τὸ φρονεῖν, ὥστε τοιαῦτα ἔπεσον πλὴν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ὅλων πραγμάτων εἶναι ἀλλὰ μὴ εἰς υἱόν. "But the Title of *unbegotten* (or *Self-existent*), no Man can be so absurd as to presume to give to any other, than to the *Supreme God*; no, not even to the Son himself;" *Cont. Eunom. Lib. 3.* And the Learned Bishop *Bull*; Qui filium propriè dici posse ἀντίθεον, hoc est, a seipso Deum, pertinaci Studio contendunt; hæc sententia——Catholico consensui repugnat; "They (saith He) who contend that the Son can properly be stil'd *God, of himself, [or Self-existent]*, their Opinion is contrary to the *Catholick Doctrine*;" *Defens. Sect. 4. Cap. 1. § 7.* And again, Piam et Studiosam Juventutem serio hortor, ut a Spiritu sibi caveat, ex quo talia profecta fuerint; "I Earnestly exhort all pious and Studious Young Men, to take heed of such a Spirit from whence such Things as these, [*viz. Ridiculing the Distinction between God Self-existing, and God of God,*] do proceed." *ibid. § 8. See Scrip. Doct. Note on §. 12, 34.*

makes the Persons to *be* and to be *stiled* Gods, not by *Nature*, but by *Grace*: In which Sense, *Angels*, *Magistrates*, and *Prophets*, are call'd Gods in Scripture. But if the Divine Powers and Dominion be deriv'd to, and exercis'd by, a Nature, Person, or intelligent Substance, *universally*, *permanently*, and *unalterably*; such a Being or Person is God by Nature *ὁὖν θεός*, as truly as Man is *ὁὖν ἄνθρωπος* by Nature Man: And the whole Universe, the visible and invisible Worlds being the Subject of the Exercise of these Powers, the Being or Person therewith invested is hereby *Heir and Lord of all Things*, or God *over all*; only, with St Paul, always *excepting Him that did put all Things under Him*.

This is the true Meaning of Gal. 4. 8. refer'd to by the learned Objector. Had not the Scriptures *This* Sense of the Word God, they cou'd not be intelligible or reconcilable. Did the Scriptures absolutely confine the Sense of the Title God, to the *Metaphysical* Definition, of one *necessary*, *self-existent*, *underived*, *independent*, *supreme* Being; 'tis evident there cou'd possibly be but one Being or Person ever stiled God, in *This* Way of Speaking; and, by Consequence, the Son, or our Lord Jesus Christ, being confessedly *derived* or *generated*, (however *unknown* the Manner of his Derivation be,) cou'd be no God at all: Which is contrary to Scripture: And therefore This cannot be the only Scripture-Sense of the Term God. Hence I cannot but conclude, that there appears to Me no other Way to reconcile Scripture to *itself* or to *Reason*, but by such a Scheme as Dr Clarke hath propos'd; and therefore I cannot but acquiesce in it.

S E C T III.

As to *ANTIQUITY*.Qu. 1st.

WHether it be not clear from all the genuine Remains of Antiquity, that the Catholick Church before the Council of Nice, and even from the Beginning, did believe the Eternity and Consubstantiality of the Son; if either the Eldest Creeds as interpreted by those that recite them, or the Testimonies of the earliest Writers, or the publick Censure pass'd upon Hereticks, or particular Passages of the ancientest Fathers, can amount to a Proof of a Thing of this Nature?

Qu. 2^d.

Whether the Dr does not either equivocate or prevaricate egregiously, when He says, the Generality of Writers before the Council of Nice were in the Whole clearly on his Side; when it is manifest they were in the general no farther on his Side, than the allowing of a Subordination amounts to, (that is, no farther than our own Church is on his Side;) while, in the main Points of Difference, the Eternity and Consubstantiality, they are clearly against Him; that is, they were on his Side, so far as we are willing to acknowledge Him right, but no farther?

Qu. 3^d.

Whether the Dr might not be suppos'd to say, the Fathers are on his Side, with the same Meaning and Reserve, that He pretends our Church-Forms to be on his Side; that is, provided He

He may interpret as He pleases, and make them
speak his Sense, tho' contradictory to their own?

Whether the true Reason why the Dr does
care to admit of the Testimonies of the Fa-
thers, as Proofs; may not be, because they are
against Him?

Whether it be at all probable, that the pri-
vative Church shou'd mistake, in so material a
point as this is; or that the whole Stream of
Christian Writers shou'd mistake, in telling us
what the Sense of the Church was; and whether
a Cloud of Witnesses can be set aside, with-
out weakening the only Proof we have of the Canon
Scripture, and the Integrity of the Sacred
Text?

Whether private Reasoning in a Matter above
Comprehension, be a safer Rule to go by,
than the General Sense and Judgment of the pri-
vative Church in the first 300 Years; or, (sup-
posing it doubtful what the Sense of the Church
was within That Time,) whether what was de-
termin'd by a Council of 300 Bishops soon after,
with the greatest Care and Deliberation; and
satisfy'd Men of the greatest Sense, Piety
and Learning, all over the Christian World for
400 Years since; may not satisfy Wise and
Good Men now?

Whether supposing the Case doubtful, it be not
Wise Man's Part to take the safer Side; rather
think too highly, than too meanly, of our
blessed Saviour; rather to pay a Modest De-
ference to the Judgment of the ancient and mo-
dern Church, than to lean to one's own Under-
standing?

Qu. 8th. *Whether any Thing less than clear and evident Demonstration on the Side of Arianism, ought to move a Wise and Good Man, against Many, and so Great Appearances of Truth the Side of Orthodoxy from Scripture, Reason and Antiquity? And whether we may long wait, before we find such Demonstration*

Qu. 9th. *Whether the Revivers of Arianism among us, have not sufficiently expos'd their Cause, their many little Shifts, Artifices, Collusions, Equivocations, and transparent Sophistries that have been us'd to support it?*

Qu. 10th. *Whether the honest Man, that thinks new Body of Scripture necessary to maintain his Cause, and is therefore labouring to bring in Apostolical Constitutions; be not very much in the right, and Wise quoad hoc; despairing of sufficient Proofs to his Purpose, from the Scriptures which we have at present?*

A N S W E R.

TH E S E ten Queries with Regard to the ancient Antenicene Church, are all offer'd in such an extraordinary Manner, and all of them so plainly contain what the School call a *Petitio Principii*; with great Assurance taking That always for granted, which nevertheless yet was prov'd, nor (I verily believe) ever can be; viz. that the General Tenour of Antenicene Catholick Antiquity runs for the Scholastick Notion of Individual Consubstantiality, that I might be well excus'd, if I return'd

ther Answer to them, than a bare Negation. But because the doing so, wou'd be only my particular Denial of what a more learned Person hath affirm'd, which therefore wou'd be a Disadvantage to what I think the Cause of Truth; I answer, as follows,

That it is not only not clear, that the *Ante-Answ. to* Nicene Church profess'd the Notion of *Indivi-Qu. 1st.* dual Consubstantiality in three Divine Persons; but on the contrary, for every single Passage which the learned Querist can bring from the Genuine Remains of such Antiquity, to prove an Individual Consubstantiality in the three Divine Persons, or in two of them; I dare promise to return him five or ten times the Number, which are directly opposite to That Doctrine. Nay, I am fully perswaded, the learned Objector cannot produce one single Passage in all Catholick Antenicene Antiquity, which proves an Individual or numerical (p) Consubstantiality in the three Divine Persons. Petavius, and other learned Writers, both Popish and Protestant, have been so fair as to acknowledge, and to prove at large, that much the greatest Part of the Primitive Fathers, were of an Opinion very different from the present Scholastick Notion.

As to the Creeds the learned Querist here mentions; nothing is more evident and confessed among learned Men, than that none of

I 3

the

(p.) Unless perhaps some Sabellian Expressions of Clemens Alex-
trinus in his first Writings, and of Theophilus, Tatian, and Athenagoras,
be alledged to That Purpose; which yet is proving what the learned
Querist calls Orthodoxy, to be indeed Sabellianism, and, by Conse-
quence, not the Catholick Doctrine.

the *Credo* drawn up in the *Three first Centuries* express the Notion he contends for. Nay Bishop Bull, and Curcellaus, and Dr Cudworth and Dr Clarke, have unanswerably shown that in the *Nicene Creed* itself, the very words *ὁμοῖος* and *ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς*, are directly contrary to the Notion of *Individual Consubstantiality*, which is expressed by *τὸ αὐτὸ οὖν* or *μορφῆς*, and which was first introduced in the *Latin Church* by Means of the ambiguous Words, *unius Substantia*, put as the Rendering of the Greek *ὁμοῖος*, which itself is not ambiguous.

Then, as to the Censures past upon Hereticks in the first Ages; to omit what passes in relation to Sabellius and Praxeas, nothing is more Remarkable in History, than the Condemnation of Paul of Samosata at the Council of Antioch about the Year 260, holding *ὁμοῖος* in the Sense of *Individual Consubstantiality*; and the Condemnation of Photinus at the Council of Sirmium, about the Year 350, in which Council was censured the Asserting of Christ to be the *λόγος* or *ὁ λόγος* or *ὁ γεννητός* of the Father. Therefore Secondly, it was not candidly or impartially ask'd,

Ans. to
2d.

Whether the Dr did not either equivocate or prevaricate egregiously, when He said the Generality of Writers before the Council of Nice were in the Whole clearly on his Side. The Doctor (I think) spoke the Words of Truth and Sincerity; As appears from the very numerous and plain Quotations he has alledged out of those ancient Authors; and will be made further evident to all learned and unprejudic'd Persons, as soon as Dr Whitby's Observations on Bishop Bull's

Bull's *Defensio Fid. Nic.* appears in the World. The Latter Part of this second Querie, is partly inconsistent with the first Querie and with itself, and partly the Result of meer Prejudice. It is inconsistent, to allow a Subordination in an Individual Consubstantiality; and 'tis the Effect of Prejudice, to say that Antiquity is clearly against the Dr, without attempting or (I am perswaded) being at all able to prove it.

Not to take notice, that this Third Querie *Ans. to* contains merely an invidious Suggestion, and 3^d. not any Argument; The learned Querist can never prove, that the Creeds and even the most Modern Forms of the Church are on His Side, or consistent with Individual Consubstantiality. And I desire Him to reconcile either the Nicene or even the Athanasian Creed, (and much more, the numerous far ancients Forms of speaking, used in the Liturgy,) to His Notion; or to themselves, any other Way than according to Dr Clarke's Scheme.

The Dr hath largely shown, that the Antenicene Fathers and Councils are generally and *Ans. to* clearly on his Side; and agree with Him in 4th. Every Interpretation of Scripture, wherein He disagrees with the School-Notions. So that the Reason why the Dr doth not admit their Authority for Proofs, is not, as the Querie suggesteth, because they are against Him; but because, tho' they are clearly for Him, yet in Matters of Faith He allows of none other Proof than the infallible Testimony of the Word of God. And tho' the Authority of the Fathers of the Church, could it be prov'd to be unanimous against Dr Clarke, ought

not to determine any Article of Faith, because such Authority is still fallible and Humane; yet doth not this (as the 5th Querie suggesteth) at all affect or weaken their Evidence for the Proof of the Canon of Scripture.

Ans^r to
5th.

For, *That Evidence*, is an Evidence of *Fact* only; and requires nothing but the *Integrity* of those who relate what Things were done in their own Time, and what was, in *Fact*, received in the Church from the Beginning; as appear'd to *Them* by the *Testimony* of those who liv'd before them, conveyed without Interruption to, and received in, their own Times. If the Querist therefore here meant no more, than that the *Testimony* of the whole *Stream of Antiquity* is sufficient to determine in *Fact* what Faith the Church hath always professed and declar'd in her Publick Forms; the *Testimony* of Antiquity in *This* respect, we acknowledge to be undeniable. But then *This* is by no Means applicable to the Case in *Question* at present before us: Because the Dr has very largely shewn by his numerous Quotations out of *Antiquity*, that the Primitive Church was very far from being universally of That Opinion, which the Querist, without Any good Ground, takes it for granted that They were; And also because moreover, (as I before observed,) supposing the Fathers had unanimously (which is very far from the Truth,) declared for the Notion of *Individual Consubstantiality*; yet whether such a *Testimony*, (in a *Question* not of *Fact*, like That concerning the Canon of Scripture, but of *Judgment and Reasoning*;) whether, I say, such a *Testimony* would prove that those Scriptures, which are *our* as well as *Their* Rule, do indeed reveal it; or whether such an

Interpre-

Interpretation of Scripture, as they (suppose) all agreed in, would be as infallible as the Scripture itself; This is a Question which I believe no sober or reasonable Person will determine in the *Affirmative*.

Not only the Primitive Church in the first 300 Years, (which the Querist most unjustly lays Claim to;) but also the *Great Council* of 300 Bishops met at *Nice*, plainly knew nothing of the *Individual Consubstantiality* he speaks of, if the Creed then made is to determine their Knowledge or Judgment. And so I turn That Querie against the Querist, laying Claim to the *Nicene* Confession. If any Consobstantiality (*literally speaking*,) is to be found in that Creed, it is the *Specifick*, not *Individual* or Numerical One: For I am willing to suppose and believe, that the Querist is not Ignorant of the true and only Sense of the Word *ὁμοούσιος*. But yet indeed, whether in That Creed it is to be understood in a strict Grammatical, or Oratorical and Figurative Sense; is more perhaps than either He or I can determine. But here I cannot but take Notice, that, besides numerous particular Fathers, the *Council* of *Antioch* before, and the *Council* of *Ariminum* and other Councils after, (some of them with a greater Number of Bishops than met at *Nice*,) determined against the *ὁμοούσιος*; Because the Querist speaks of This, as the last and most Solemn Determination, made with Care and Deliberation, (which does not appear,) and submitted to as a Decision not to be any more controverted, (which was very far from the Truth of the Case.) This 6th Query therefore is indeed hugely *Romantick*.

Ans. to
6th.

The

Ans. to
9th.

The learned Querist asks, *whether (supposing the Case doubtful) it be not a wise Mans Part to take the safer Side; rather to think too highly, than too meanly, of our Blessed Saviour?* I Answer: Questionless it is. And This indeed is the most plausible Pretence, which the Defenders of the Scholastick Notion alledge for themselves. They think that the professing of *individual Consubstantiality* in the three Divine Persons, is at least (tho' it should prove erroneous,) an *advancing the Dignity of the Son and Holy Spirit*; and so, if it be a Fault, that 'tis of the *safer Side*, by giving too much rather than too little. But this Plea, when well considered, proves as weak and false, as any other they ever alledge.

For, in the *First Place*; is not the true and just Measure of Honour due to each Divine Person, to be taken from that *Revelation*, which distinctly declares their particular Dignity and relative Attributes to Us by whom this Honour is to be paid? Since then the Revelation is (as is confess'd on all Hands) the only Rule in this Case; if we go beyond, or if we fall short, are we not equally culpable? Can any Man think to please *the Son of God*, by giving That to him which He never claim'd or could claim? By confounding *His Honour* with That of the *Father*, when *He Himself* ever profess'd and shew'd the most perfect Obedience to him? By making Him absolutely equal, who disclaimed all *Equality*; and whose highest Character is *His being in the Form of God, the Image of the invisible God, the express Image of his Person*? Compare *Heb. 1, 3*; with *Col. 1, 15*. It neither is nor can be any Detraction from the Dignity of any Person, (how Great soever
That

That Dignity be,) to forbear professing Him to be That which he really is not. It is no Detraction from the Honour of the *Prince of Wales*, to declare He is not *The King of Great Britain*. Nay, it is most reasonable to suppose, it must *displease* an holy and a perfect Being, not capable of Pride or Flattery, to have Those Honours paid Him, which He himself hath declar'd belong not to Him. It may well become serious and sincere Christians to consider whether it is not *possible*, that while, adventuring to be wise beyond what is written, they vainly think to advance the Honour of the Son of God above what He hath given them Ground for in the Revelation, they may dishonour the Father that *sent* Him; attributing even to the beloved *Son*, that which is incommunicable and peculiar to the *Father*. It may become them to consider, what they will answer at the *great Day*, if God should charge them with not observing that Declaration of his, *I will not give my Glory to another*; and if the *Son of God*, who *came not to seek his own Honour*, but to *honour his Father*, should charge them with detracting from the supereminent Dignity of the Father, under Pretence of superadding to *His* more than He required. If it be true, that *He that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father which sent Him*; it must also be true, that He that honoureth not the *Father* who *sent* the Son, with his *supreme and peculiar Adoration*; honoureth not the *Son* who came to declare and command it.

But, *Secondly*, the Defenders of the Scholastick Notion, by professing an *Individual Consubstantiality*, are indeed so far from *honouring the Son* in the *highest Manner*, and *above* what is done by Others; that, in Reality, they de-

prive

prive Him altogether of That Honour which is due to Him as the Son of God; nay, they rob him of the very Foundation, on which *Any Honour* can be claim'd to Him, viz. his very *Being* and *Existence*. For 'tis apparent, that if the Son of God be the *Individual Essence* or *Substance* of the *Father*, he can differ from Him no otherwise than in *Name*, which is no *real Difference* at all: And so, by unavoidable Consequence, *Jesus Christ* is but a *meer Man*, in whom Divine Powers and Perfections are manifested: Which Notion is exactly *coincident* with the *Sabellian* or *Socinian* Scheme. And how a *meer Man* is capable of those Divine Honours, which the Scriptures give to *Jesus Christ*, the *Son of God* as well as *Man*; let the Defenders of the Scholastick Notion, who so freely charge the *Socinians* with *Idolatry*, answer (if they can) for Themselves. Thus it appears, that even the *lowest Arians*, really give more Honour to the *Son of God*, or our *Lord Jesus Christ*, than the Defenders of the Scholastick Notion do.

Ans. to
8th.

As to the *great Appearances of Truth* on the Side of the Scholastick Notion, (to which the Querist gives the Name of Orthodoxy,) drawn from *Scripture, Reason, and Antiquity*; and against which, he demands no less than *evident Demonstration* for the other Side (which He unjustly * calls *Arianism*.) I think it plain from what hath been already said on the fore-going Heads, that they are indeed *Appearances only*; But that the *real Truth*, clearly lies against His Notion. And if it be impossible, by the *Rule of Scripture, and Reason*, and the Sense of the most *ancient Writers and Councils* of the Church, that the Scholastick Notion which the Querist

* See above pag. 94. in the Answer to Querie 2d about Adoration and Worship.

rist

rist contends for, should be true; and if there is no *Medium* betwixt *His*, and the Notion of *Dr Clarke*; then it will be *demonstrated*, that the Explication given by *Dr Clarke*, (which He unreasonably calls *Arianism*,) is the True Doctrine of Jesus Christ and his Apostles as reveal'd in *Scripture*, and the true Sense of *Scripture* interpreted by *right Reason*, and as understood by the best and most *ancient Christian Writers*. Whether this be not the Case, the Reader will judge, from what hath been already said, and from what I shall further (in the *Appendix*) offer by Way of *Querie* in *My Turn*.

I know of no other *Shifts*, *Artifices*, *Collusions*, *Equivocations* or *Sophistries*, which the modern *Revivers of Arianism*, (as the learned Querist is pleased *very unjustly* to call them, but with Submission I beg leave to say, *the Assertors of true Primitive Christianity*,) are guilty of; but interpreting *Scripture* in an intelligible and reasonable Manner, according to the Analogy of the most numerous and most plain Texts, without submitting their Understanding and Conscience to the blind Notions of Scholastick Writers. I have endeavoured to explain and prove the Truth of those Principles, which the Querist is pleased to judge so hardly of; and I think I have done it, without any *Equivocation*, &c. I am sure, I should be ashamed to be found supporting Any Cause by such Methods, and therefore utterly renounce them in this important Controversy; (And I cannot but think the learned Querist, when he considers seriously with himself, will find himself to blame for using such Language) Nor do we desire (as the *Last Query* suggesteth) a *New Body of* *Scripture*,
Answ. to 9th.
Answ. to 10th.

Concerning the Sense of Antiquity.

Scripture, to defend our selves by. All that we desire, is, That the *old one* be preserved; That it be acknowledg'd for a *Rule*; That it be interpreted by *Reason* and by *Itself*; and That no humane and fallible Authority be set up in *Opposition* to it, or in *equal Conjunction* with it.



THE

A
H
thors
genui
pass'd
or an
tically
weak
Script
furthe
Argum
Matte
Satisf
nothin
enqui
partia
Resola
turn
and to
by T
Manr
and A

THE APPENDIX.

HAVING finished my Answer to the Queries proposed by certain learned Authors; I hope their Candor and impartial Ingenuity will acknowledge, that I have not pass'd any Thing by, slightly or negligently; or answered any of them triflingly or sophistically. If they think that I have us'd any weak or unconvulsive Arguments, either from Scripture or Reason; or if they have any Thing further to add, to strengthen their Queries or Arguments; I shall willingly consider of the Matter again, in Order to give or receive full Satisfaction. I am sure that I have Concern for nothing but Truth; and desire that it may be enquir'd after, with Diligence, Calmness, Impartiality, Charity, and Christian Courage and Resolution. To conclude: I beg leave to return the learned Authors their Compliment, and to propose some Queries to be answered by Them: And I will offer them, in the same Manner with Theirs; from Scripture, Reason, and Antiquity.

Q U E R I E S

QUERIES

Drawn from Scripture, Reason, and Antiquity, concerning the Scholastick Explication of the Doctrine of the Trinity and Incarnation.

Preliminary QUERIES.

- Qu. 1st. **W**HETHER the *Scriptures* are not the only Rule of supernatural or revealed Truth?
- Qu. 2d. Whether it is not the common Right of all Christians at all Times, freely to examine and debate the Sense of the *Scriptures*? Therefore,
- Qu. 3d. Whether Any particular humane Interpretation or Explication of any Doctrine reveal'd in them, can be lawfully impos'd and receiv'd as of Indisputable Authority?
- Qu. 4th. Whether free and Christian Debates in all Matters of Religion, are not consistent with the Peace of the Church; and therefore whether the Peace of the Church can justly be objected, in order to suppress them?

Whether

Whether the Only Foundation of the Breach Qu. 5th.
of the Church's Peace, be not laid by those,
who endeavour to impose, as of *indisputable* Au-
thority, humane Doctrines, not certainly and
clearly contain'd in the Word of God?
Therefore,

Whether if Disputes in Points of Religion Qu. 6th.
happen at any time to disturb the Peace of
the Church, Those Persons are not the Cause
of, and only answerable for such Disturbance,
who insist to impose upon the Faith of Chris-
tians, as of *indisputable* Authority, humane
Doctrines not certainly or clearly reveal'd in
the Word of God? Hence,

Whether it be not the best and most effectual Qu. 7th.
Way of preserving Peace and Unity, and
of avoiding Schisms; to take Care that all
Doctrines impos'd as necessary Parts of Chris-
tianity, be either in express Words declar'd in
Scripture, or deduc'd from it by plain and *in-
disputable* Consequence?

SECT. I.

As to *SCRIPTURE*.

Consider the following Texts relating to
the Divine *Trinity*.

MATT. 28, 19. Go and teach all Nations, baptising
them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son,
and of the holy Ghost.

Joh. 15, 26. But when the Comforter is come, whom I
will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of Truth
which proceedeth from the Father, He shall testify of
Me.

QUERIES

Drawn from Scripture, Reason, and Antiquity, concerning the Scholastick Explication of the Doctrine of the Trinity and Incarnation.

Preliminary QUERIES.

- Qn. 1st.* **W**HETHER the *Scriptures* are not the only Rule of supernatural or revealed Truth?
- Qn. 2d.* Whether it is not the common Right of all Christians at all Times, freely to examine and debate the Sense of the *Scriptures*? Therefore,
- Qn. 3d.* Whether Any particular humane *Interpretation* or *Explication* of any Doctrine reveal'd in them, can be lawfully impos'd and receiv'd as of *Indisputable Authority*?
- Qn. 4th.* Whether free and Christian Debates in all Matters of Religion, are not consistent with the *Peace of the Church*; and therefore whether the Peace of the Church can justly be objected, in order to suppress them?

Whether

Whether the Only Foundation of the Breach Qu. 5th.
of the Church's Peace, be not laid by those,
who endeavour to impose, as of *indisputable* Au-
thority, humane Doctrines, not certainly and
clearly contain'd in the Word of God?
Therefore,

Whether if Disputes in Points of Religion Qu. 6th.
happen at any time to disturb the Peace of
the Church, Those Persons are not the Cause
of, and only answerable for such Disturbance,
who insist to impose upon the Faith of Chris-
tians, as of *indisputable* Authority, humane
Doctrines not certainly or clearly reveal'd in
the Word of God? Hence,

Whether it be not the best and most effectual Qu. 7th.
Way of preserving Peace and Unity, and
of avoiding Schisms; to take Care that all
Doctrines impos'd as necessary Parts of Chris-
tianity, be either in express Words declar'd in
Scripture, or deduc'd from it by plain and *in-
disputable* Consequence?

SECT. I.

As to *SCRIPTURE*.

Consider the following Texts relating to
the Divine *Trinity*.

MATT. 28, 19. Go and teach all Nations, baptising
them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son,
and of the holy Ghost.

Joh. 15, 26. But when the Comforter is come, whom I
will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of Truth
which proceedeth from the Father, He shall testify of
Me.

2 Cor. 13, 14. *The Grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the Love of God, and the Communion of the Holy Ghost be with you all.*

Matt. 3; 16, 17. *And Jesus, when He was baptis'd, went straightway out of the Water; and lo, the Heavens were opened unto him, and He saw the Spirit of God descending like a Dove, and lighting on Him; and lo, a Voice from Heaven saying, this is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased.*

Rom. 15, 16. *That I should be the Minister of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles, ministring the Gospel of God, that the Offering up of the Gentiles might be acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost.*

— 30 *I beseech you Brethren for the Lord Jesus Christ's sake, and for the Love of the Spirit, that ye strive together with me in your Prayers to God for Me.*

1 Cor. 12; 4; 5, 6. *There are Diversities of Gifts, but the same Spirit.* —

And there are Differences of Administrations, but the same Lord. —

And there are Diversities of Operations, but it is the same God, which worketh all in all.

Ephes. 4; 4, 5, 6. *There is One Spirit. — One Lord. —*

One God and Father of all, who is above All.

Qu. 1st.

Whether these Texts, (to which many others might be added,) do not prove a Trinity of real distinct Persons, that is, intelligent Agents? And whether the Names of Father, Son, and Spirit or Holy Ghost, (especially since the Spirit is elsewhere call'd, the Spirit of the Father, and also of the Son; *See Gal. 4, 6;*) do not prove a relative Subordination in the Divine Persons?

Qu. 2d.

Whether a relative Subordination in three intelligent Agents or Persons, be not necessarily a Subordination in Nature, Essence or Substance? And whether Relative and Correlative Beings or Persons, can subsist in one and the same individual Subject? And whether, if they could subsist in One individual Subject, they

would

would
they
preme
vine
Corre
can b
vine
W
as in
Agen
Reas
is not
intelli
meer
whic
own,
or w

Com

Co

J
kn
and
sent.

I C
but O
and o
Eph
One L
of all

(9
(r)
MSS.

would not nevertheless be *Three Gods*, if they were Persons co-ordinate and equally supreme? And whether the same individual Divine Substance can be subordinate, Relate and Correlate to itself? and if not, whether there can be identical Consubstantiality in the three Divine Persons?

Whether a Person in *Divinis* be not the same Qu. 3d. as in *Humanis*, to wit, an intelligent or rational Agent or Being? And whether the true and only Reason why we call the blessed *Trinity*, *Persons*; is not, because they are reveal'd to be distinct intelligent Agents? Or whether a *Trinity* of meer Names, Modes, Attributes or Distinctions, which have no real Existence or Being of their own, be consistent with the foregoing Texts, or with the Tenour of Revelation?

Compare the following Texts relating to the *Unity* of God, one with another.

Concerning the *Father*.

Concerning the *Son*.

JOH. 17, 3. *That they might know Thee, the only true God; and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.*

Joh. 1, 1. *And the Word was (q) with God, and the Word was God.*

1 Cor. 8, 6. *But to Us, there is but One God, the Father;— and one Lord, Jesus Christ.*

Heb. 1; 8, 9. *Thy Throne, O God, &c. Wherefore God even Thy God, &c.*

Eph. 4; 4, 5, 6. *One Spirit,— One Lord,— One God and Father of all, who is above all.*

Rom. 9, 5. *Christ came, who is over all, (r) God blessed for ever. 1 Cor. 15, 27, He is excepted, which did put all Things under Him.*

1 Joh.

K 2

(q) with God; not ἐν τῷ θεῷ, but μετὰ τὸν θεόν apud Deum.

(r) Note, that the Word θεός [God] is wanting in some Ancient MSS.

Joh. 1, 18. No Man hath seen God at any Time.

Joh. 6, 46. Not that any one hath seen the Father.

1 Joh. 1, 1. That which was from the Beginning; which we have heard, which we have seen with our Eyes, which we have look'd upon, and our Hands have handled of the Word of Life.

Qu. 1st.

Whether this Title, *The one God*, being predicated in the Texts above-mention'd, and throughout the whole Scriptures without one Exception, of the *Person of the Father only*; doth not denote the *Supreme Godhead* or *Divinity* of the Father? And whether all other Beings or Persons are not excluded from being *The One God*? If not; whether it can be true, that the Father is *The One and the only true God*?

Qu. 2d.

Whether *Christ's* not being included, does not appear from the Texts relating to the *Unity* of the Father's Godhead; as also by the Texts wherein *He Himself* is expressly call'd *God*? For otherwise; if He be included in the former, then whether *the Only true God*, [Father, Son, and Holy Spirit,] could send His Son *Jesus Christ*, according to *Joh. 17, 3*? Or the *One God*, [Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,] could be *the one Lord Jesus Christ*, according to *1 Cor. 8, 6*? And if the latter, (*viz.* the Texts wherein He himself is expressly stiled *God*,) do not show him not to be *The one God* which the Father is; then whether *St John* could reasonably say, that the *same God* was with the *same God*, i. e. with *Himself*? Or whether *St Paul* would say, that the *same God* was the *God of the same God*, i. e. again, of *Himself*? Therefore

Qu. 3d.

Whether the Word (*God*) when spoken of the *Father*, and when of the *Son*, is not to be under-

under-
mer,
the
he is
This
tialit
W
The
Him
who
perf
divid
same

(f
876 a
and
gedy
" Nei
" eve
" eve
" of
" trin
An
Deum
ipse,
" The
" dec
" rev
" the
" vea
An
τω
" in
" unf
" upo
An
a nem
poteft
" Fat
" by
Clarke

understood in a different Meaning; of the former, as of the *supreme independent Being*; of the latter, as of one who derives All that he is and has, from Another? And whether This be consistent with *individual Consubstantiality* and metaphysical *Co-equality*?

Whether He who is stiled absolutely (f) *Qu. 4th.*
The Invisible God, i. e. who never manifested Himself under any visible Form; and He who is stiled God visible, manifested in the Flesh, personally seen and felt and heard, can be individually and metaphysically One and the same God? And whether such a Difference as

K 3

this,

(f) *Justin Martyr* saith: ἔτε ἔν 'Αβραάμ, ἔτε 'Ισαάκ, ἔτε 'Ιακώβ, ἔτε ἄλλῳ ἀνθρώπῳ οἷδε ὁ πατήρ καὶ ἀρρήτον κύριον ἢ πάντων ἀπάντων, καὶ αὐτῷ τῷ χεῖρ. ἀλλ' ἐκείνον ὃ καὶ βελὼ πῶς ἐκείνη, καὶ θεὸν ὅντα υἱὸν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἄγγελον ἐκ τῶ ὑπερεῖν τῇ γνώμῃ αὐτοῦ.
“Neither Abraham, nor Isaac, nor Jacob, nor any other Man ever saw the Father and ineffable Lord of all Things absolutely, even of Christ Himself; but [they saw only] him who by the Will of the Father is both God, and his Son and Messenger, as ministering to his Will.” *Dial: cum Tryph.*

And *Irenaeus*: *Pater quidem invisibilis; de quo & Dominus dixit, Deum nemo vidit unquam: Verbum autem ejus, quemadmodum volebat ipse, & ad Utilitatem videntium, Claritatem monstrabat Patri;*
“The Father [saith He] is invisible, concerning whom our Lord declares, No Man hath seen God at any Time: But his Word has reveal'd the Brightness of the Father, according to the Will of the Father, and as was most advantagious to them whom he reveal'd it to.” *Lib. 4. c. 37.*

And *Athanasius*: Ἀποσαλμίνῃ τε καὶ τῷ το νοηθήσεται, ὅτι ἀρρήτῳ ἐκλήσεται τῷ σώματι πατρὸς, σῶματι δέδωκεν ἑαυτὸν. “And in this Respect He must be understood to be sent; that, by the unspeakable Will of his Father who is incapable of Body, he took upon him a Body.” *Cont. Sabell.*

And the Learned *Bishop Bull*: *Ex ipsorum Sententiâ, Deus Pater a nemine unquam, ne per assumptas quidem species, visus est, aut videri potest:* “According to Their [the Ancient's] Opinion, God the Father neither hath been, nor can be seen by any Man, no not by assuming a visible Appearance.” *Señ. 4. c. 3. §. 4.* See Dr *Clarke's Scrip. Doct. Part. 2. Notes on Señ. 36.* This

this, doth not necessarily imply the two Persons to be each *God* in *different* Senses; and so demonstrate the Word (*God*) to be us'd in Scripture in *different* Senses?

Qu. 5th.

Whether an *Essential Subordination* in Persons who are call'd *God* in Scripture, be not very well consistent with the absolute and personal Unity of *God* declar'd in Scripture? Or whether there can be properly speaking any more than *One God*, (tho' more Persons than *One* may be stiled *God*;) when there is confessedly but one *supreme independent* Godhead?

Compare

This was the Sense, not only of the *Christian*, (as has been already prov'd; See above, pag. 22, &c.) but of the most Ancient *Jewish Church* also. Accordingly the *Old Chaldee Paraphrase*, the *Jerusalem Targum*, and the most learned *Rabbinical Commentators*, do commonly interpret the *Jehova* appearing or speaking to *Adam*, to the *Patriarchs*, to *Moses* and the *Prophets*, of [the *Memra*] the *Substantial* and *Personal Word* of *God*, or the *Angel* the *Messias*. This is abundantly shewn by *Dr Scot*, and the learned Author of the *Judgment of the Jewish Church against the Unitarians*, and by others. But the *Inferences*, which these learned Persons draw from thence, are very wrong; viz. that the *Jews*, by their Interpretations, design'd to teach, that the [Memra or] *Messias*, was *Jehova* or the *Supreme God* himself whom they worship'd. Whereas the plain and *Natural Conclusion* is; they understood, that the [Memra, or] *Angel Messias*, represented the *Supreme Jehova*; that He was sent to act immediately in the *Name* and by the *Authority* of *Jehova*, who reveal'd Himself by *Him*. Thus when we read that the *Lord* (*Jehova*) reveal'd Himself to *Samuel* in *Shiloh* by the *Word* of the *Lord* (*Jehova*), 1. *Sam.* 3, 21; This *Word*, the above-mention'd learned Author thinks the *Jews* understood of the *Substantial* or *Personal Word* of *God*, or the *Messias*. See *Judgment of the Jewish Church*, &c. pag. 237. This the *Jews* gather'd from *Exod.* 23; 20, 21, where *Jehova*, (represented by the *Angel*,) tells *Moses* that He sends his *Angel* before him, and that his *Name* (his *Power* and *Authority*) is in him: Which *Angel*, the ancient *Jews* unanimously understand to be the [Memra or] *Messias*, by whom *Jehova* deliver'd the *Law* to *Moses*, and rul'd his *People Israel*. And they frequently declare this to be their Sense, by telling us that *Jehova* or *God* spake

spake
and
his W
Abra
mad
45, 1
Hof.
Jeru
Phil
Savio
Testa
begott
2; T
cul.
Lib.
that
Testa
the M
no oth
or D
Angel
and to
the G
of Go
of Go
sonal
Natur
meer
our, R

Com

R
I T
and o
bath
Eph
of all
Mar
high

spake to Adam by his Word : Thus the *Jerusalem Targum*, *Jonathan* and *Onkelos* on *Gen.* 3 ; 8 ; 9. That He judg'd the *Old World* by his Word ; *Jonathan* on *Gen.* 6, 6. That he made a Covenant with *Abraham* by his Word ; *Jonathan* and *Onkelos* on *Exod.* 6, 8. That he made the Earth and Man by his Word ; *Chaldee Paraphrase* on *Isai.* 45, 12. That by his Word he receiv'd their Prayers ; *Jonathan* on *Hos.* 14, 5. Lastly, That He promised to redeem them by his Word ; *Jerusalem Targum* on *Gen.* 49. 18. And so in other Places. And *Philo*, expressing the Sense of the *Jewish Church* before and in our Saviour's Time, tells us that all the Appearances of God in the *Old Testament*, were by the *Logos* ; who (He saith) is the Angel and only-begotten Son of God, *πρεσβύτερος ἢ ὅσα γέγονε*, *Leg. Allegor. Lib.* 2 ; That he is *ὑπαρχὸς τῆς μεγάλης βασιλείας*, *De Somn. ἢ de Agri- cul. Lib.* 2 ; That he is *ὄργανον θεῷ δι' ὃ ὁ κόσμος κατεσκευάσθη*, *Lib. Cherub* ; And therefore he calls him, *ἀντίστοιχόν θεῷ ὡς τὸ πᾶν*, *Quaest. ἢ Solut.* Hence it evidently appears, that the Notions which the Ancient *Jews* gather'd from the *Old Testament* concerning the *Messias*, are agreeable to the Revelation of the *New Testament* concerning our Lord *Jesus Christ*. And there is no other Difference betwixt them, but This ; that whereas the *Memra* or *Divine Word* was, both before and under the *Law*, sent as an Angel or Messenger to represent the Person of the Supreme *Jehova*, and to act solely and wholly in his Name ; in the last Days, or under the Gospel Dispensation, he came and was sent as the *Christ* or Son of God ; to act indeed by the *Will*, and *Authority*, and in the Name of God the Father ; but withal to reveal and declare the distinct personal Characters and Offices, with which he was invested in our Nature ; That he was now appointed by God, not as his Angel and meer Representative, but to be in his own distinct Person, the Saviour, King and Judge of all the World.

Compare the following Texts concerning Divine Powers, Mission, and Authority

Of the Father.

Of the Son.

ROM. 16, 27. To God only wise.

1 Tim. 6 ; 15, 16. The blessed and only Potentate, — who only hath Immortality.

Eph. 4, 6. One God and Father of all, who is above all.

Mark 5, 7. The Son of the most high God.

Mark. 13, 32. Of that Day and hour knoweth no Man, no not the Angels, neither the Son, but the Father ; (the Father only, Mat. 24, 36.)

Joh. 6, 57. I live by the Father.

Joh. 10, 29. My Father which gave them Me, is greater than all.

Joh.

Rom. 9, 29. *The Lord of Sabaoth (or of Hosts.)*

Rev. 4, 8. *Holy, Holy, Ho'y, Lord God Almighty (Gr. ὁ παντοκράτωρ supreme Lord over all.)*

Joh. 14, 28. *My Father is Greater than I.*

Joh. 5, 19. *The Son can do Nothing of Himself.*

Joh. 5, 27. *And hath given Him Authority to execute Judgment also.*

Joh. 5, 43. *I am come in my Fathers Name.*

Joh. 6, 38. *I came down from Heaven, not to do my own Will, but the Will of Him that sent Me.*

Qu. 1st.

Whether *Supremacy of Dominion*, and *Original Independent Powers*, be not attributed to *God the Father only*, in the Texts of the first Column? And whether more Persons than one, can be *supreme and independent*? If not, whether the *supreme independent Divine Substance*, can be more than *One Person*? And if it could be *More supreme and independent Persons than One*; whether such Persons would not clearly be a *Plurality of Gods*, notwithstanding the *Unity of Substance*? *Many Supremes*, are *Many Gods*; and if there be but *One Supreme*, there is but *One God*; whatever be, or be not, the *Substance* of any other *Agent or Person* whatsoever. [The Heathens thought even the *Souls of Men*, to be ὁμοῖοι to God; yet *That* did not make them *All* to be esteemed, *The One God*, or *Equal* with him].

Qu. 2d.

Whether in the Texts of the *second Column*, to which some *Hundreds* might be added; there be not a manifest *Subordination* in *Powers and Authority* betwixt the *Father* and the *Son*? Whether the *second Person*, whose whole *Person* was *deriv'd, sent, and authorized* to act in the *Name* of the first *Person*, be not truly *inferior* to *Him who sent, &c*? Whether an *absolute and metaphysical Co-equality*, can be consistent with those Texts and the whole *Tenour of Scripture*? Whether

Whether they who interpret the Texts, which Qu. 3d. mention God's *sending his Son into the World*, and the Son's *coming down and being sent from Heaven*; of a *pre-existing humane Soul* distinct from the $\alpha\beta\gamma\theta$, in order to support an *absolute Co-equality* in the Divine Persons; do not show too little regard to the Word of God, by doing this without any Ground from Scripture? Whether also they do not confute themselves, by rendring it impossible to distinguish betwixt the *Divine* and *Humane* Nature of Christ, or to know at all whether Christ had any *Divine Nature* distinct from the *pre-existing Soul*? and so, whether they do not unavoidably run either into the very lowest *Arianism*, or give great *Handle* to the *Socinians* to support themselves by this Argument against all Opponents whatsoever?

Compare these Texts, Concerning Divine Honour and Adoration.

Spoken of the Father.

Of the Son.

LUKE 4, 8. *Thou shalt Worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve.*

Matt. 6, 9. *After this Manner pray; Our Father which art in Heaven.*

Joh. 4; 23, 24. *Shall worship the Father, in Spirit and in Truth; the Father seeketh such to worship him: God is a Spirit: — shall worship the Father, ver. 21.*

Rom. 15, 6. *That ye may with one Mouth Glorify God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.*

Ephes. 1. 17. *That the God*

Joh. 14, 13. *Whatsoever ye shall ask in My Name, that will I do, that the Father may be Glorify'd in the Son.*

Phil. 2, 11. *That every Tongue shou'd confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the Glory of God the Father.*

Heb. 1. 6. *When He bringeth his first begotten into the World, He saith, let all the Angels of God worship Him.*

Rev. 1; 5, 6. *Unto Him that lov'd us and wash'd us from our Sins in his own Blood, and hath made*

of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of Glory.

Rev. 4. 8. *Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God Almighty.*—

Rev. 15. 3, 4. *And they sang the Song of Moses the Servant of God, and the Song of the Lamb, saying, Great and Marvellous are thy Works, Lord God Almighty; who shall not fear Thee, O Lord, and glorify thy Name? For Thou only art Holy, for all Nations shall come and worship before Thee.*

made us Kings and Priests unto God and his Father, to Him be Glory and Dominion for ever and ever.

Qu. 1st.

Whether the Supremacy of God the Father's Honour and (t) *Worship*, be not most clearly asserted and vindicated in the Texts of the first Column? and whether any other Beings or Persons whatsoever, can any more receive the same or equal Honour, than they can be the one supreme God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the alone Almighty (ὁ παντοκράτωρ) and Father of Glory? And therefore, whether all Honour, Worship, Praise

(t) *Justin Martyr*, describing the Practice of the primitive Church, saith; ἐν παντί τε οἷς προσφερόμεθα, εὐλογῶμεν τὸν πατέρα ἡμῶν διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, καὶ διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου. "And in all our Oblations, we give Praise to the Creator of all Things, through his Son Jesus Christ, and through his Holy Spirit." *Apol. 2.*

Again, τὸν δημιουργὸν τῆς вселουνοῦς καὶ πάντων τῶν ὄντων θεὸν μαθόντες, καὶ ἐν δευτέρᾳ χάριτι ἔχοντες, — ὅτι μετὰ λόγου τιμῶμεν, ἀποδείξομεν. "We Worship the Maker of the Universe: And I shall shew that we do also with good Reason honour, in the Second place, Him who became our Master, and taught us these Things, being the Son of the true God." *Apol. 2.*

And *Origen*: Πρωτεύοντων — μόνῳ τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρί. "All Prayers ought [primarily or ultimately] to be offer'd to God the Father only." *De Orat.*

Prai
mate
V
the
the
Sub
Such
ther
ulti
11?
hav
sent
his
tanc
Hon
and
Fath
to t
Hou
faith
com
rity
3, 4

(u)
μετα
"gor
"W
An
τα
μεθα
ην
[says
"Sup
"Wor
"givi
"wh
"whi
See S

Praise and Adoration be not *primarily* or *ultimately* due to the *Father only*?

Whether the *Honour* and *Worship* paid to Qu. 2d. the *Son of God*, agreeably to the Texts of the Second Column, is not manifestly a (u) *Subordinate* or *inferior* Honour due to Him? Such an Honour, as is *commanded* by the Father to be given Him, *Heb. 1, 6*; and tends ultimately to the *Glory of the Father*, *Phil. 2, 11*? Such an Honour, as the Son cou'd not have been invested with, had he not been sent by the Father, and *redeem'd Mankind with his Blood* by the good Pleasure and free Acceptance of the Father, *Rev. 1, 5, 6*? Such an Honour, as is *only due to Him*, as the beloved and only-begotten Son of the Father; the Father's Great Minister and Agent, exalted to the *Throne* and *Dominion* of his *Father's House* (the Church,) upon Account of the faithful Discharge of the Offices and Trusts committed to Him by the Supreme Authority of the Father; according to *Heb. 3, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6*? Therefore,

Whether

(u) *Justin Martyr* saith: Τὸν γὰρ ἀπὸ ἀγεννήτου καὶ ἀρρήτου θεοῦ λόγον, μετὰ τὸν θεόν, προσκυνῶμεν καὶ ἀγαπῶμεν. "Next after the unbegotten and ineffable God, we worship and love him who is the Word of God." *Apol. 1.*

And *Origen*. Πᾶσαν μὲν γὰρ δέησιν — καὶ εὐχαριστίαν ἀναπνεύματι τῷ ὀπί πᾶσι θεῷ, διὰ τοῦ ἀρχιερέως, ἐμφύχου λόγου καὶ θεοῦ. Δευρόμεθα δὲ καὶ αὐτῷ τῷ λόγῳ, καὶ εὐχαριστήσομεν, εἰς τὸ δυνάμεθα κατακύειν τὴν πρὸς πνεύματι κυριολεξίαν καὶ καταχρήσεως. "We ought [says He] "to send up all Supplication and Thanksgiving to the Supreme God over all, through our High Priest, who is the living Word, and God: We may also offer Supplications and Thanksgivings to the Word himself, if we can distinguish between that which is Prayer in the highest and most proper Sense, and that which is so figuratively and subordinately." *Contr. Cels. lib. 5.* See *Scrip. Doct. Par. 2. Notes on § 44, 51.*

The Appendix.

Whether the Scriptures do not plainly speak of *two* distinct Sorts of Divine Honour; one, *absolute* and *Supreme*, God the *Father's* Peculiar and Prerogative; another, *Subordinate* and *deriv'd*, given to the Son by the Father, for the greater Manifestation of the Father's Glory, who begat Him, and sent him into the World, to reveal the Father's Supereminent Dignity and Perfections and Will unto Men, and to die for their Sins; and raised him from the Dead, and exalted him to the Right hand of the Throne of God?

Qu. 4th.

Whether the *Unity* of Divine *Worship*, spoken of in the Texts; (*Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only*, [αὐτῷ μόνῳ, *Him Personally, His Person only*,] *shalt Thou serve*, Luke 4, 8; and, *I will not give my Glory to Another*, Isai. 48, 11;) be not clearly *consistent* with the *Honour given to Christ*, without supposing Him to be the same *Individual*, or absolutely and metaphysically *equal* with the *One God the Father* spoken of in those Texts? Whether (I say) This be not made very clearly consistent; by declaring, as the Scriptures have done, that the Honour due to Christ, is *distinct* and *Subordinate*, given by the *Father's Command*; and paid, not upon Account of *Original* or *deriv'd* Perfections, but upon Account of his being *begotten*, and *sent* into the World, and *redeeming* Mankind by his Blood, and having *All Judgment committed unto him*? According to which Notion, the Worship due to each Person, is proper, and incommunicable to Any other; and nothing is or can be given to One, of That which belongs to Another.

Con-

Concerning the Incarnation, Satisfaction for Sin, Redemption, and Intercession of Christ; See the following Texts.

J O H. 1, 14. *The Word was made Flesh.* —
1 John 1, 1 *That which we have heard, which we have seen with our Eyes, which we have looked upon, and our Hands have handled of the Word of Life.*

Rom. 8, 3. *God sending his own Son, in the Likeness of Sinful Flesh.*

Phil. 2; 6, 7, *Who being in the Form of God, —*

—8. Made himself of no Reputation, and took upon him the Form of a Servant, and was made in the Likeness of Men; [made like unto his Brethren, Heb. 2, 17.] and being found in Fashion as a Man, He humbled Himself, and became Obedient unto Death, &c.

Heb. 2, 14. *He also himself likewise took part of Flesh and Blood, that through Death, &c.*

—10; 5, 10. *A Body hast thou prepared me: — Through the offering of the Body of Jesus Christ.*

1 John 2; 1, 2. *If any Man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the Righteous,*

—and He is the Propitiation for our Sins.

—2; 19, 22. *They went out from us. — He that denieth that Jesus is the Christ. **

—4; 1, 3, — *Try the Spirits. — Ever Spirit † that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the Flesh, is not of God.*

—4, 10. *Not*

* Against Cerinthus, who taught that Christ was not really incarnate, but that Jesus (the Man born of the Virgin,) was One Person, and Christ (the Divinity which descended upon him) was Another. See Irenaus's remarkable Account of this Opinion, cited in the following Page. That all these Texts were intended, not against Infidels, but antient Hereticks; is plain from the whole Context.

† The learned Dr Mills observes, that very Many ancient Copies read this Text Thus; *Every Spirit* [ὁ πνεῦμα καὶ Ἰησοῦς] *which dissolveth Jesus, &c.* According to which Reading, it is directed against Cerinthus, who separated Jesus from Christ, making him Two Persons; and taught that Christ was not really incarnate, but only descended upon Jesus, and left Jesus [the mere Man] at the Time of his Crucifixion, to suffer Alone; So that Christ did not really suffer, but nominally or imputatively only. And the True Sense even of our Present Vulgar Reading of this Text, may possibly be the very same.

—4, 10. Not that we lov'd God, but he lov'd us, and sent his Son to be the Propitiation for our Sins.

—5, 1. Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God.

2 John 7. — Confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the Flesh.

1 Pet. 3, 18. — Put to Death in the Flesh.

—4, 1. Christ has suffered for us in the Flesh.

Rev. 5, 9. Because thou wast slain, and hast redeem'd us to God by thy Blood.

Qu. 1st.

Whether the *Word* incarnate and made (w) passible, according to the express Declaration

(w) In the Epistle ascrib'd to St Barnabas, we read: *πιστεύωμεν ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκ ἡδυνάτο παθεῖν, οἱ μὴ δι' ἡμᾶς* "Let us believe that the Son of God cou'd not have been capable of Suffering, but for our sakes."

And Justin Martyr; *ὅπως ὁδωμεν ὅτι ὁ πατὴρ τὸ ἑαυτοῦ υἱὸν καὶ τοιούτοις πάθειν ἀληθῶς μηχανῆται δι' ἡμᾶς ἐρεῖληται* καὶ μὴ λέγωμεν ὅτι ἐκείνου, τοῦ θεοῦ υἱὸς ὢν, ἐκ ἀντελαμβάνετο τῆς γονιμῶν καὶ συμβάντων αὐτοῦ. "That we may know that it was the Will of the Father, that his own Son shou'd really undergo such Sufferings for our sakes: And that we shou'd not say that He, being the Son of God, did not feel what was laid upon Him." Dial. cum Tryph. p. 331.

Again, *κηρυχθέντα δι' αὐτοῦ παθόντα λόγον* "The Word, whom they, in their Preaching, declared to have suffer'd." pag. 336.

And Irenæus; καὶ διότι ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ σαφὲς ἐγένετο, καὶ ἔπαθεν, εὐχαριστοῦν "And to give Thanks, because the Word of God was made Flesh, and suffer'd." Lib. 1. And the Apostolical Constitutions; *Συνεχώρησε παθεῖν τὸ τῇ φύσει ἀπαθὴν, υἱὸν τὸ ἀγαπῶν, τὸ θεὸν λόγον* "He [God the Father] condescended that his beloved Son even God the Word, who in his [unincarnate] Nature was impassible, shou'd suffer (for us.)"

And the learned Bishop Bull observes, that in some ancient Creeds the Word *impassibilem* [uncapable of Suffering,] was plac'd after *Omnipotentem* [Almighty,] as a distinguishing Character of God the Father. Cap. 3. Sect. 4.

Remarkable is that Passage of Irenæus, lib. 1. c. 25. Cerinthus docuit, — post baptismum descendisse in eum Christum, — in finem autem revolasse iterum Christum de Jesu, & Jesum passum esse & resurrexisse, Christum autem impassibilem perseverasse, existentem spiritalem: "Cerinthus (saith he) taught that Christ descended upon Jesus at his Baptism, and that at length Christ departed again from Jesus, and that Jesus suffered and rose again, but that Christ continued incapable of suffering, being Spiritual."

on of St John and St Paul cited above; can be Individually consubstantial with the one Supreme God? or whether the one Supreme God can be incarnate, and passible?

Whether They who interpret the Incarnation Qu. 2d. to be only an extraordinary Manifestation of Divine Powers and Perfections in the Man Christ Jesus, and make only the mere Humane Nature passible; do not show too little regard to the plain Evidence of Scripture; and thereby also fall necessarily into Socinianism, and deny the Satisfaction for Sin as much as the Socinians do?

Whether, notwithstanding any partial Consideration of distinct Natures or Persons in Christ, and any Communication of Properties in the Hypostatical Union, (as the Schools speak;) Christ or the Son of God, can be That individual supreme Deity, to whom He is the Advocate in our Behalf, and to whom He hath redeem'd us by his Blood as God-Man; and yet not be Advocate, or redeem us, to Himself or his own Person, but to the Person of the Father, as the Scripture every where declares?

Whether another Soul distinct from That Person who was made Man, who came in the Flesh, and who took Part of Flesh and Blood, (as the Apostles express it,) be ever clearly and plainly predicated of our Lord Jesus Christ in Scripture? And doth it not deserve a careful Inquiry, whether the supposing such an one, may not be a dividing of Jesus Christ into two Persons; and fall in with Nestorianism or Cerinthianism? Consider carefully the Texts above.

Whether They who, to avoid the Absurdity of making Jesus Christ two Persons, say that the humane Soul had never any distinct Sub-

Subsistence of its own, but existed in the *Logos*; do not reduce the humane Soul to a meer *Mode* or *Accident*, and hereby fall into the *Notion* which they design'd to confute?

S E C T. II.

As to *R E A S O N*.

[The Pious and Christian Reader will here observe, as no inconsiderable Confirmation of the *Truth* of the Gospel; that none of the *Difficulties in point of Reason*, proposed in the following Queries, do at all lie against any Part of the Doctrine revealed in *Scripture*, but merely against the *Notions* wherewith *Scholastick Writers* have perplexed the plain *Doctrine of Christ*.]

Qu. 1st.

WHETHER the Term *God* does not, always, signify a *Person*: Compare *Heb. 1, 3*, with *Col. 1, 15*? And whether, if the one supreme *God* be one *Person*, and the *Person* of the *Father* be (as is declared in *Scriptures*) That one supreme *God*; the *Son*, who is acknowledged to be a distinct *Person* from the *Father*, can be The one supreme *God*?

Qu. 2^d.

Whether, if The one supreme *God* be not one, but Three *Persons*; any single *Person*, as *Father* or *Son*, can be The one Supreme *God*? And thence again, whether *God* and *Divine Person* be not the same?

Qu. 3^d.

Whether it may not come under a *Suspicion* of erroneous *Worship*, to worship the *Person* of the *Father* as the one supreme *God*, if He be not the *Whole Godhead*? Or, if He be the *whole Godhead*, whether the *Person* of the *Son* can be the same *whole Godhead*, without being the *Person*

Person of the Father? And so, whether two or three Persons can be one individual Person?

Whether, if the Son is individually and meta-^{Qu. 4th.} physically the same God as He who begat the Son, He [viz, the Son] must not beget a Son too; except the same God did, and did not, beget a Son? And whether thus, if He begat a Son, He did not beget Himself: Which is indeed begetting nothing at all; because He Himself must be, before He could act, i. e. before he could beget Himself.

Whether Father and Son, being Relate and^{Qu. 5th.} Correlate, can subsist but in distinct Subjects? And whether a Third Person, distinct from Both, can subsist in the same individual Subject? Or, whether the same individual Nature or Subsistence, can be Father, and Son of the same Father, and yet at the same time be Neither of them, but be a Third Person proceeding from Both? And, if all This could be; yet whether Three such Persons, if Equal and co-ordinate, would not be truly and really Three Gods, however united or conjoyn'd in one *ὁμοῦμενον*, in one individual metaphysical Substance?

Whether, if the Son and Holy Spirit be Ne-^{Qu. 6th.} cessary Emanations of the Substance of the Father, and be the same individual Substance with the Father, there must not be necessary Emanations likewise from Them; the same unchangeable Divine Substance, always lying under the same Necessity? And whether hence it doth not plainly follow, that either there must be Emanations, Generations, and Processions in infinitum, of the Divine Substance; and so, an infinite Number of Persons; or else, if this cannot be true, that then the Son is begotten, and the Holy Spirit proceeds or is derived, (according to the Sense of almost all Antiquity,) by the Will of the Father? L Whether

Qu. 7th.

Whether the Defenders of the *scholastick* Notion, unless they fall in with *Socinianism* in making a *Trinity* of mere *Modes*, are not unavoidably guilty of *Tritheism*, by professing and adoring three *absolutely equal* Divine Persons, that is, Gods? Or whether, if the Term *God* does not signify a single Person, they do not come under a just Suspicion of *erroneous Worship*, who pay the Worship of God to a *single Person* which is not the whole entire *Deity*?

Qu. 8th.

Whether the Pretence of these *scholastick* Notions (which are no where found in *Scripture*, but are the Reasonings of *Men* only,) being *above Comprehension*; is any thing more than a *Blind*, to hide the Weakness of their Arguing, and the Inconsistency of their *Doctrine*?

Qu. 9th.

Whether sincere Christians are not in Conscience oblig'd to acknowledge, that the vulgar *scholastick* and unintelligible Notions and *humane* Expressions of *modern* Invention concerning the Doctrine of the *Trinity*, ought *not to be imposed* as *Necessary* parts of Christ's Religion; or else to disclaim *Reason* in the Interpretation of *Scripture*, and return to the *Romish infallible Authority*?

S E C T. III.

As to *ANTIQUITY*.

Qu. 1st.

Whether the Titles ($\delta \pi α τ η ρ ο κ ε λ η ρ$, $\delta α γ ε ν ν η θ$, $\delta \epsilon \pi \iota \pi α σ ι \theta ε ο ς$, $\delta ω ρ θ$ & $\delta ε σ π ο τ η ς$ & $\delta η μ ο κ ρ α τ η ς$ & $\delta λ ο ν$: also, *summus Deus*, *extra comparem*, *unus verus* & *solus Deus*;) attributed to God the Father only, by the whole
Tenour

Tenour of *Antenicene* Catholick Antiquity; particularly by Clem. Romanus, the Apostolick Constitutions, Ignatius, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Novatian, Clem. Alex. in his Strom. Origen and Eusebius; do not evidently denote the Supremacy of God the Father's Divinity, in the Judgment of the Primitive Church?

Whether, to ascribe to the Son of God the Title *θεός*, and never *ὁ θεός* in an absolute Construction, but only *ὁ μονογενὴς θεός*, or *ὁ θεός λόγος*, and the like: Whether, to call it absurd and profane to stile Him *αὐτόνομος* and *ὁ ἐπὶ πάντι θεός*, (See Orig. adv. Cels. Lib. 8. pag. 387. Euseb. contr. Marcell. Lib. 1. c. 7. Histor. Eccles. Lib. 1. c. 2. pag. 6.) Whether, to call the Son *ἐπεὶς υἱός*, also *ἐπεὶς ἢ ἀριθμῶ παρὰ τοῦ πατέρα*, also another *δυνάμις*, (see Justin. Dial. with Tryph. pag. 275, 276, 285. Euseb. Eccles. Hist. lib. 1. c. 2.) Whether, to call the Father and Son and Holy Spirit, *ἐν τῇ ὑποστάσει τρεῖς*, (interpreted by Hilary, "per substantiam tria;") Thus the Council of Antioch: Also to stile the Father and Son *δύο εἰσας*, *δύο φύσεις*, *δύο φῶτα*, *δύο δυνάμεις*, *δύο πρᾶγματα*. (See Orig. περὶ Εὐχ. pag. 48. Comment. in Job. pag. 70. Contra Cels. lib. 8. Basil. de Greg. Thaum. Epist. 41, pag. 61. Method. apud Phot. Cod. 23. pag. 937. Basil. de Dionys. Alex. Epist. 41, pag. 60. Euseb. cont. Marcell. pag. 25.) Whether, I say, this Way of speaking by the whole Tenour of *Antenicene* Greek Writers, doth not clearly show Their Judgment of the Contradistinction of the *θεότης* of the Son from that of the Father, or can any Way be reconcil'd to the Notion of Individual Consubstantiality?

Whether, to affirm (according to the general Tenour of *Antenicene* Antiquity,) that

God the Father is ἀχώρητος, ἀπαθής, ἀδραστής; the λόγος, χωρὶς, παθὴς, ὁρατός; Thus Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, and Theophil. Antioch. Whether, to say that the Father is *μείζων καὶ κρείττων τοῦ λόγου*, that the Son is *ἐκ ἰσχυρότερος ἀλλ' ὑποτάσσεται τῷ πατρί*, so Origen; With Irenaeus, that *Pater portat Verbum suum*; With Novatian, that *Pater praeceat filium*, and That for This Reason, because *Pater Originem nescit, Filius habet*; also that the Son, *minor Patre est*. Whether, to say with Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Novatian, and most of the Antenicene Fathers, that the λόγος was the Father's Minister and Agent, and obey'd his Will and Command in creating the World. Whether, to say that the Son receiv'd his Divine Nature, and became God, *θελήματι καὶ εὐδοκίᾳ τοῦ πατρὸς*, as say the Greek Fathers; *Donatione & voluntate Patris*, as the Latins. Whether, to say that the Son is *θεός, ἀλλ' ἔχει ὁ πατήρ θεός*, but *μεσίτευσα καὶ μετὰ αὐτὸν ὅσα φύσις* between the Nature of the unbegotten God and the Creatures; Thus Orig. cont. Cels. lib. 3, pag. 131; Alexand. Bishop of Alex. Euseb. Demonst. Evang. lib. 5, c. 4. pag. 227. Lastly; whether, to call the Son *spiritus primus creatus*, with Hermas; *πρεσβύτερος καὶ πᾶντων δημιουργημάτων*, and *πρωτόκτιστος*, with Origen, Clem. Alex. and Eusebius: Whether, I say, all the Fathers who affirmed these Things, as appears from their remaining Writings, could mean less than that the Son was subordinate and inferior to the Father in Nature and Perfections?

2d. 4th.

Whether, to say with Justin Martyr, that God the Father was only or primarily to be worship'd; and that the Angel or Messenger, who is his Son, was by his Will to be honour'd in the second Place: And with Origen, that Prayer in the highest and most proper Sense is only

due

due to the Father, but, in a *subordinate* Sense, and by the *Command of the Father*, is offer'd to the Son as our Intercessour: And with *Eusebius*, that the Son commanded us to account his *Father the only true God*, and to worship Him *alone*: Whether, I say, This be not evidently to make *God the Father the supreme*, and the *Son a subordinate Object of Worship*?

Whether, from the abovesaid Testimonies, *Qu. 5th.* and many more which might be brought, it be not apparent that the general Tenour of *Antenicene* Antiquity, runs against an *Individual Consubstantiality* and *absolute Equality* in the Divine Persons? And whether, if *such a Cloud of Witnesses* be of any *Authority*, this Controversy is not clearly by *Them* decided, against the Defenders of the scholastick Notion, and in Favour of the Scheme of *Dr Clarke*?

Whether the Notion of Christ's being [*λογος ενδιδαδενος*] *the internal Reason* of the Father, and [*ομοιος*], as understood by Some in the same Sense with [*ταυπος*], *individually consubstantial* with him, may not justly be suspected to have arisen originally from the Ancient Hereticks? For whereas *St John* twice [*Joh. 1, 1; and Rev. 19, 13,*] styles him [*ο λογος*, and, *ο λογος τω θεω*], *the Word of God*; the natural Sense of which Title, according to the Analogy of the whole Old and New Testament, and the frequent Use of the same Title [*ο λογος*] in *Philo Judæus*, is to represent him as the *Mouth* or *Messenger* of the *Father*, and the Great *Revealer* of his Will, in *Dictating* his Laws, and *Pronouncing* Sentence according to them: Did not the *Cabbalists*, and the *Valentinians* and other *Gnosticks*, first introduce the *Metaphysical* Notion of certain *Sephiroth*, *Æons*, or [*προβολαι*] *Projections* or *Emissions* from God? One of which, they called [*εννοια*] *Thought*,
and

and [Σιγῇ] Silence, (alluding to a Thought in the Mind not yet spoken forth;) which did ἀποκωῆσαι Νῦν ἁμοῖον τοῦ ἰσὺν τοῦ πατρὸς περιβαλόντι, *Irenæus lib. 1, cap. 1*? And were not these *Probola* or *Æons*, by Some esteemed [ταυτοῖσι or ὑποκρίσει] individually consubstantial, as being only *Ideas* in the Mind, or mere *Powers* and *Attributes* of God, without a distinct *Life*? And did not hence *Theophilus* and * *Tatian* and some others, make the Son to have been first potentially in the Father, as [his λόγος ἐνδιάθετος] his internal silent Reason, but not begotten or spoken forth, or generated or produced [περὶ τοῦ αἵματος] into a Person or Son, till just before the Creation of the World? And did not This give Rise to One Branch of the *Montanists*, [stiled The † Followers of *Æschines*,] and afterwards the *Sabellians*, who made the Son a mere *Mode* or *Power* of the Father's Substance, without a distinct *Life*? And were not the same *Probola*, or *Æons*, by Others esteemed consubstantial PARTS of the Divine Substance; whence came the Notions of Another Branch of the *Montanists* and *Cataphrygians*, [they who followed *Proculus* or *Proclus*,] and even *Tertullian* himself, who made the Son a PART of the Father's Substance, [*Derivatio Totius & Portio*; adv. Prax. cap. 9?]
And was not *Paul* of *Samosata* condemned at the Synod of *Antioch*, before the Time of the Council of *Nice*; and *Marcellus* at the Council of *Constantinople*, after the time of the Council of *Nice*; for supposing the Son to be in the former of these two Senses individually consubstantial

* Of whom *Tertullian* says, *totus secundum Valentinum sapi*, "he wholly follows Valentinus." *De Præscript. cap. 51.*

† *Tertullian. de Præscript. cap. 52.*

al with the Father? And were not *All* the fore-mentioned Notions condemned, together with Photinus, at the Council of *urminum*? And does not Some mens *scholastick* and *metaphysical* Explanation of *ὁμοούσιον* at This day, to the same Sense with *καυπόσιον*; necessarily fall back again too nearly into the Notions of Paul of *Samosata* and *Sabellius*?

Whether the Council of *Nice* which † *estab-*
lish'd the Terin *ὁμοούσιον*, (though, as *Curcellanus*,
and Dr *Cudworth*, and Bishop *Bull*, and Dr *Qu. 7th*:
Clarke have unanswerably shown, they were
far from meaning thereby an *Individual Con-*
substantiality;) was more infallible than the
Council of *Antioch*, which 60 Years before re-
jected

† It is necessary here to take Notice, that the Word *ὁμοούσιον* was not only, after much Debate and serious Consideration, rejected by the *Primitive* and *Orthodox Council* of *Antioch*, met to condemn *Paulus Samosatenus* about 60 Years before the Council of *Nice*; but that, when it was propos'd to the Council of *Nice* itself, it met with great Opposition, and was variously understood even by the Persons who then subscrib'd it; and was at last inserted into the Creed, at the Instance of the *Emperor Constantine*, (who himself had not as yet been baptiz'd,) not as being either a *Scriptural Word*, or any direct and necessary Consequence from the Words of Scripture, but (as *St Ambrose* somewhere says) *ut nefanda Hereseos [Arianæ] caput amputaret*; "that it might at one Stroke cut off the Head of the impious [Arian] Heresy" The Account which the learned *Eusebius* gave of this Matter to his Diocess, is very remarkable, viz. *Ταύτης τῆς γενομένης ὑπ' αὐτῆς ὑπαγερωθείσης, ὥπως εἰρηλυσάμενοι τοῖς ἐκ τῆς ἐσίας τῆς πατρὸς, καὶ τοῖς πατρὶ οὐμοσίον, ἐκ ἀντιθέσεως αὐτοῖς καταλιμπάνομεν. Ἐπερωτήσεις τοιγαρὶν καὶ ἀπεκρίσεις ἐντεῦθεν ἀνεκινῆντο. ἐβασανίζεν τε ὁ λόγος πῶς διανοίαν ἔσθ' εἰρημάνον. καὶ δὴ τὸ ἐκ τῆς ἐσίας ὁμολόγητο πρὸς αὐτῆς, δηλωτικὸν εἶναι, τῆς ἐκ μητρὸς τῆς πατρὸς εἶναι, καὶ μηδ' ὡς μέρος ὑπάρχειν τῆς πατρὸς. — καὶ μὴ μέρος τῆς ἐσίας αὐτῇ συγγένειν. Διόπερ ταύτῃ τῇ διανοίᾳ καὶ αὐτοὶ σω-επθέμεθα, καὶ δὲ τὸ φωνῶν [here Dr Clarke's Note is, "viz. ἐσία, not ὁμοούσιον, as Socrates has it, for of That He speaks by and by;"* *Script. Doct. p. 467*] *ὡς γὰρ ἐφ' αὐτῇ τῇ ἐκ τῆς ἐσίας σκοπεῖται ὁρθολογῶν*

jected That Term? and Whether the Apostles Creed, and other the most ancient Creeds, were not as compleat Systems of Faith without the *ὁμοίον*, as That of Nice was with it? If they were, then

Qu. 8th. Whether those Professions of Faith which made and kept the Church Christian and Catholick for 300 Years, are not alone sufficient to make and keep it so Now? And whether *ὁμοίον*, a Word unscriptural, in its literal and grammatical

ἡμῶν κειμήριον, καὶ τὸ μὴ τ' ὀρθῆς ἐκπεσεῖν διανοίας. καὶ τὰ αὐτὰ δὲ καὶ τὸ γεννηθέντα καὶ ποιηθέντα, κατεδέξαμεθα ἐπειδὴ ποιηθέν κοινὸν ἔρασκον εἶναι πρὸς ἑαυτὰ καὶ λοιπῶν κτισμάτων. καὶ διὰ τὴν οὐκ ἔχοντων ὁμοίων, ὡς ἐδὲν ὁμοίον ἔχειν τ' υἱόν. δι. δὴ, μὴ εἶναι αὐτὸν ποίημα, τοῖς δὲ αὐτῶν γεννομένοις ὁμοίον. κρείττον' δὲ, ἢ κατὰ πᾶν ποίημα, συγχάνειν ἐσίας, ὡς ἐκ τῆς πατρὸς γεγεννηθῆ διδάσκει τὰ θεῖα λόγια, τὸ τρῶς τ' γεννήσεως ἀνεκφράστου καὶ ἀνεπλοκίστου πάσῃ γεννητῇ φύσει συγχάνοντι. ἔγω δὲ καὶ τὸ ὁμοίον εἶναι τὸ πατρὸς τ' υἱὸν ἱερατικῶς ὁ λόγος σωίστησιν, καὶ κατὰ τὴν τῶν σωμάτων τρῶπον, καὶ τοῖς θνητοῖς ζώοις ἀπαπλησίως. ἔτι γὰρ κατὰ διαίρεσιν τ' ἐσίας, ἔτι κατὰ ἀποτομῇ [ἀλλ' ἐδὲ κατὰ πᾶσιν] ἢ ἀλλοίωσιν τ' τῶν πατρὸς ἐσίας τε καὶ δυνάμεως. [here the Note of Dr Clarke is, 'quære annon forte legendum, ὁμοειδέως, ut infra;'] τῶν γὰρ πάντων ἀλλοιείαν εἶναι πρὸς ἀγέννητον φύσιν τῆς πατρὸς. παρὰ τὸν δὲ εἶναι, τὸ πατρὸς τὸ ὁμοίον, τὸ μηδεμίαν ἐμφανείαν πρὸς τὰ γεννητὰ κτίσματα τ' υἱὸν τῆς θεῆς ἐμφανίζειν. μόνω δὲ τὸ πατρὸς τὸ γεγεννηκός, κατὰ πάντα τρῶπον ἀφομοιοῦν καὶ μὴ εἶναι ἕξ ἑτέρας πνύς ὑποστάσεως καὶ ἐσίας, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῆς πατρὸς. καὶ αὐτὸς τῶν ἐμφανθέντων τὸν τρόπον, καὶ ὡς ἔχειν ἐφάνη συγκαταθεῖσθαι. — τίτε δὲ ἀφιλονείκως τὰ μὴ λυπεύοντα κατεδέξαμεθα, ὅτε ἡμῖν ἐγνωμότως καὶ λόγων ἱερατικῶς τ' διανοίας, ἐφάνη σωτῆρ' εἶναι τοῖς ὑφ' ἡμῶν αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ παρεκτεθείσῃ πίσει ὁμολογημένοις. "When this Creed [says He] was propos'd in the Council, I did not pass it over without strictly examining what was meant by being from the Substance of the Father, and, consubstantial with the Father. Upon which, much Debate arose; and an exact Enquiry was made into the Signification of the Expressions. And they confess'd that the Phrase from the Substance [of the Father] was only to declare, that the Son was of [or from] the Father, but not as a Part of the Person or of the Substance of the Father. For which Reason, I also agreed to This Sense of the Phrase, without rejecting the Manner of expressing it; being intent upon

"Peace;

grammatical Sense contradictory to the Unity and Simplicity of the Divine Nature, and, either as expressing *individual* or *specifick* Consubstantiality, (unless in such a *lax* and *figurative* Sense, as *Eusebius* and many of the *Nicene* Fathers themselves explain'd it in, and were by the *Council* itself permitted so to do,) utterly *irreconcilable* to the *Nicene Creed* itself; may not now (whenever it can be done in the Spirit of Peace and Charity,) with as much Reason be laid aside by the Wisdom of the *reform'd Church*, as it was *authorized* by the *Church* in a *corrupt* and *contentious* Age, with

M much

“Peace, and at the same Time carefull to preserve sound Doctrine.
 “After the same manner also I consented to the Expression, *begotten*,
 “not *made*; seeing they alledg'd that the Word, *made*, commonly
 “denoted the System of created Beings brought into Existence by
 “the Son himself; between which, and the Son, there was no Si-
 “militude. Wherefore it ought not to be said of Him, that He was
 “made; because this was rendering Him like to the Things which
 “were made by him. Whereas his Substance was far more excel-
 “lent than any Thing that was made; the Scripture teaching us that
 “it was begotten of the Father, the Manner of his Generation being
 “at the same Time ineffable and incomprehensible to every created
 “Being. In the next Place, upon debating the Meaning of the
 “Phrase, *the Son is consubstantial with the Father*, it was agreed
 “that it should not be understood after the Manner that such like
 “Phrases are apply'd to Bodies, or in Similitude to mortal Beings:
 “For there was no Division of the Father's Substance, nor Dissection
 “[nor any Modification whatsoever,] or Alteration of his Substance
 “or Person; for that the unoriginated Nature of the Father, is ab-
 “solutely incapable of all these Affections: But the Phrase, *being*
 “*consubstantial with the Father*, was used with Intention to declare,
 “that the Son was not to be likened to the Things which were made
 “by Him, but that He is the express Image of his Father who begat
 “Him; and that He is, not from any Other Person or Substance,
 “but from his Father only. To the Expression *thus* interpreted, I
 “thought it reasonable to assent. — And I then, without any more
 “ado subscrib'd to those Things as not offensive, when, after impar-
 “tial Examination into the Meaning of the Expressions, I found they
 “agreed

jected That Term? and Whether the Apostles Creed, and other the most ancient Creeds, were not as compleat Systems of Faith without the *ὁμοίον*, as That of Nice was with it? If they were, then

Qu. 8th.

Whether those Professions of Faith which made and kept the Church Christian and Catholick for 300 Years, are not alone sufficient to make and keep it so Now? And whether *ὁμοίον*, a Word unscriptural, in its literal and grammatical

ἡμῶν κειμήριον, καὶ τὸ μὴ τὸ ὁρθῆς ἐκπεσεῖν διανοίας. καὶ τὰ αὐτὰ δὲ καὶ τὸ μνησθέντα καὶ ποιηθέντα, κατεδέξαμεθα ἐπειδὴ ποιηθέν κοινὸν ἔρασκον εἶναι πρὸς ἑαυτὰ καὶ λοιπῶν κτισμάτων, καὶ διὰ τὴν οὐκ ἐγένετο μὲν, ὡς ἐπὶ ὁμοίον ἔχει τὸ οὐκ ὄν. δι. δὴ μὴ εἶναι αὐτὸν πῶμα, τοῖς δὲ αὐτῷ γεννομένοις ὁμοίον. κρείττον δὲ, ἢ κατὰ πᾶν πῶμα, συγχάνειν ἐστίαι, ὡς ἐκ τῆς πατρὸς γεγεννηθῆ διδάσκει τὰ θεῖα λόγια, τὴν τρῶσιν τὴν γεννήσεως ἀνεκφράστου καὶ ἀνεπλόστου πάσης γεννήσῃ φύσιν συγχάνοντι. ἔτι δὲ καὶ τὸ ὁμοίον εἶναι τὴν πατρὸς τὸ οὐκ ὄν ἕξασταζ-
 ὁμοίον ὁ λόγος σωτῆρος, καὶ κατὰ τὴν τῶν σωμάτων τρῶσιν, ἐπὶ τοῖς θνητοῖς ζώοις ὡραπλησίως. ἐπὶ τῷ κατὰ διαίρεσιν τὴν ἐστίαι, ἐπὶ κατὰ ἀποτομῇ [ἀλλ' ἐπὶ κατὰ πᾶσιν] ἢ ἀλλοίωσιν τὴν πατρὸς ἐστίαι τε καὶ σωτῆρος. [here the Note of Dr Clarke is, 'quære annon forte legendum, ὡραπλησίως, ut infra;'] τίτων γὰρ πάντων ἀλλοίωσιν εἶναι πᾶσι ἀγέννητον φύσιν τὴν πατρὸς παρσαπικὸν δὲ εἶναι, τὴν πατρὶ τὸ ὁμοίον, τὴν μηδὲ μίαν ἐμφερίαν πρὸς τὰ γεννητὰ κτίσματα τὴν οὐκ ὄν τὴν θεῶν ἐμφαίνειν. μόνον δὲ τὴν πατρὶ τὴν γεγεννηκότι, κατὰ πάντα τρόπον ἀφομοιωθῆ. καὶ μὴ εἶναι ἕξ ἐτέρας πνὸς ὑποστάσεως καὶ ἐστίαι, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῆς πατρὸς. ὅ καὶ αὐτῶν τῶν ἐρμηνεύοντων τὸν τρόπον, καὶ ὡς ἔχειν ἐφάνη συγκαταθεῖσθαι. — τίτε δὲ ἀφιλονείκως τὰ μὴ λυπῶντα κατεδέξαμεθα, ὅτε ἡμῶν ἐννοητόνως καὶ λόγων ἕξασταζοι τὴν διάνοιαν, ἐφάνη σωτῆρος τῶν ὑφ' ἡμῶν αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ παρεκτεθείσῃ πρὸς ἀμολογηθῆσθαι. "When this Creed [says He] was propos'd in the Council, I did not pass it over without strictly examining what was meant by being from the Substance of the Father, and, consubstantial with the Father. Upon which, much Debate arose; and an exact Enquiry was made into the Signification of the Expressions. And they confess'd that the Phrase from the Substance [of the Father] was only to declare; that the Son was of [or from] the Father, but not as a Part of the Person or of the Substance of the Father. For which Reason, I also agreed to This Sense of the Phrase, without rejecting the Manner of expressing it; being intent upon

Peace,

grammatical Sense contradictory to the Unity and Simplicity of the Divine Nature, and, either as expressing *individual* or *specifick* Consubstantiality, (unless in such a *lax* and *figura-tive* Sense, as *Eusebius* and many of the *Nicene* Fathers themselves explain'd it in, and were by the *Council* itself permitted so to do,) utterly *irreconcilable* to the *Nicene Creed* itself; may not now (whenever it can be done in the Spirit of Peace and Charity,) with as much Reason be laid aside by the Wisdom of the *reform'd Church*, as it was *authorized* by the Church in a *corrupt* and *contentious* Age, with

M

much

“Peace, and at the same Time carefull to preserve sound Doctrine.
 “After the same manner also I consented to the Expression, *begotten*,
 “not made; seeing they alledg'd that the Word, *made*, commonly
 “denoted the System of created Beings brought into Existence by
 “the Son himself; between which, and the Son, there was no Si-
 “militude. Wherefore it ought not to be said of Him, that He was
 “made; because this was rendering Him like to the Things which
 “were made by him. Whereas his Substance was far more excel-
 “lent than any Thing that was made; the Scripture teaching us that
 “it was begotten of the Father, the Manner of his Generation being
 “at the same Time ineffable and incomprehensible to every created
 “Being. In the next Place, upon debating the Meaning of the
 “Phrase, *the Son is consubstantial with the Father*, it was agreed
 “that it should not be understood after the Manner that such like
 “Phrases are apply'd to Bodies, or in Similitude to mortal Beings:
 “For there was no Division of the Father's Substance, nor Dissection
 “[nor any Modification whatsoever,] or Alteration of his Substance
 “or Person; for that the unoriginated Nature of the Father, is ab-
 “solutely incapable of all these Affections: But the Phrase, *being*
 “consubstantial with the Father, was used with Intention to declare,
 “that the Son was not to be likened to the Things which were made
 “by Him, but that He is the express Image of his Father who begat
 “Him; and that He is, not from any Other Person or Substance,
 “but from his Father only. To the Expression *thus* interpreted, I
 “thought it reasonable to assent. — And I then, without any more
 “ado subscrib'd to those Things as not offensive, when, after impar-
 “tial Examination into the Meaning of the Expressions, I found they
 “agreed

much Heat and Faction, and perpetual Changes of Opinion, without one Precedent of so much as any One particular Church or Council for more than three hundred Years?

"agreed to what I my self had before profess'd in the Creed I had propos'd." *Euseb. Epist. ad Casaream, apud Socrat. Lib. 1. & apud Theodorit. lib. 1.*

Notwithstanding this Determination of the Council of Nice for the $\delta\mu\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma$, it was rejected about ten Years after by a greater Council than that of Nice, met at Jerusalem. The Words of Eusebius, who himself was present at it, are, *πάντην μερίσιν ὧν ἴσμεν σωσάντων διὰ τὴν σωτηρίαν ἐκείνης, ἐν αὐτοῖς ἱεροσολύμοις, &c.* "The Emperor summon'd this second Council, which was the greatest that ever I knew, to meet in Jerusalem;" *De vita Constant. Lib. 4. c. 43* This Synod not only receiv'd to Communion those who rejected the $\delta\mu\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma$, but declar'd that the Creed which they proposed, wherein That and all other new Terms were omitted, did *ἀναμφέβως σωζέειν τὴν παρά τοις πατρὶσι δόξαν καὶ ἀποστολικὴν παράδοσιν τε καὶ διδασκαλίαν*, "indisputably contain That Tradition of Faith, which All acknowledged to be Apostolical" *Athanas. De Synod. Arim. & Seleuc. § 21.*

F I N I S.

E R R A T A.

Pag.	l.	for	read
31,	15.	is not equal, ———	is equal.
36,	2,	dumeparem, ———	dum parem.
44,	20.	communicable but ———	communicable; but
61,	13.	after the Words, out of Nothing, add. Heb.	
		11, 3, were not made of things which do appear.	
82,	7,	Simple, ———	Simply.
92,	29.	Perfection, ———	Perfections.
96,	ult.	Father, ———	the Father.
141,	2.	Redmption, ———	Redemption.
	25,	Ever, ———	Every.

BOOK's Printed for James Knapton,
at the Crown in St. Paul's Church-
Yard.

THE Young Surveyor's Guide: Or a new Introduction to the whole Art of Surveying Land, both by the Chain and all Instruments now in Use. Now first Publish'd from an Original M. S. To which is added, all the useful Geometrical Definitions, Axioms, Problems and Theorems, which relate to this Art. As also the Method of Casting up the Dimensions of Artificers Work. Very useful for all Gentlemen and Others. There is also added, by way of Appendix, a new way of Surveying large Tracts of Land, according to the Learned Mr Whiston's and Mr Ditton's New Method of Surveying England by Explosions. The manner of making up and preparing Transparent Colours for Beautifying Maps, Charts, Pictures, &c. With several Copper Plates. The Tables of Artificial Numbers, Sines and Tangents, to every Degree and Minute of the Quadrant. All which is very much Improved and Corrected, By Edward Laurence, Surveyor. Pr. 3s. 6d.

A New Voyage round the World, Describing particularly, the Isthmus of America, several Coasts, and Islands in the West-Indies, the Isles of Cape Verd, the Passage by Terra del Fuego, the South-Sea Coasts of Chili, Peru and Mexico, the Isle of Guan, one of the Ladrões, Mindanao and other Philippine and East-India Islands near Cambodia, China, Formosa, Luconia, Celebes, &c. New Holland, Sumatra, Nichobar Isles; the Cape of Good Hope, and Santa Helena. Their Soil, Rivers, Harbours, Plants, Fruits, Animals and Inhabitants. Customs, Religion, Government, Trade, &c. By Capt. William Dampier. Vol. the First. Illustrated with particular Maps and Draughts. The Fifth Edition, Corrected. Pr. 6s.

Voyages and Descriptions. Vol. II. In Three Parts. viz.
1. A Supplement of the Voyage round the World, describing the Countries of Tonquin, Achin, Malacca, &c. Their Product, Inhabitants, Manners, Trade, Policy, &c. 2. Two Voyages

Voyages to *Campeachy*; with a Description of the Coasts, Product, Inhabitants, Logwood Cutting, Trade, &c. Of *Fucatan*, *Campeachy*, *New-Spain*, &c. 3. A Discourse of Trade-Winds, Breezes, Storms, Seasons of the Year, Tides and Currents of the *Torrid Zone* throughout the World, with an Account of *Natal* in *Africk*, its Product, Negroes &c. by Capt. *William Dampier*. Illustrated with particular Maps and Draughts. To which is added, a General Index to both Volumes. *The Third Edition*. Price 6 s.

A Voyage to *New Holland*, &c. in the Year 1699. Wherein are described, the *Canary-Islands*, the Isles of *Mayo* and *St Jago*. The Bay of *All Saints*, with the Forts and Town of *Bahia* in *Brasil*. *Cape Salvadore*. The Winds on the *Brasilian Coast*. *Abroho-Shoals*. A Table of all the *Variations* observ'd in this Voyage. Occurrences near the Cape of *Good Hope*. The Course to *New Holland*. *Shark's Bay*. The Isles and Coasts, &c. of *New Holland*. Their Inhabitants, Manners, Customs, Trade &c. Their Harbours, Soil, Beasts, Birds, Fish. &c. Trees, Plants, Fruits, &c. Illustrated with several Map. and Draughts; also divers Birds, Fishes and Plants, as found in this Part of the World, curiously Engraven on Copper Plates. Vol. III. By Captain *William Dampier*. *The Third Edition*. Price 6 s.

The History of *England* In 2 Vol. with the Effigies of all the Kings and Queens. The 4th Edition, continued down to the Death of Queen *Ann*. Pr. 12 s.

The Suspension of the *Triennial Bill*, the Properest Means to Unite the Nation. In a Letter to———*The Second Edition*. Price 6 d.

Syddenhams Processus Integri in morbis fere omnibus curandis, 120. Price 1 s.

Ditto in English, Translated by Dr *Salmon*, with large Additions.

Mr *Wingate's Arithmerick*, the 13th Edition.

History of the Inquisition of *Goa*, 4to, Price 1 s.

Boyer's French Dictionary, the 3d Edition.

Life of the Emperor *Leopold*.

Surgeon's Assistant.

Bosman's Description of Guinea.

Introduction to the History of *Asia*.

Ditton on Fluxions.

Dougharty's General Gauger, 120. 2d Edition.

